S. HRG. 101-655

# REVOKING THE U.N. ZIONISM RESOLUTION

## HEARING

BEFORE THE

SUBCOMMITTEE ON
NEAR EASTERN AND SOUTH ASIAN AFFAIRS

OF THE

## COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS
## UNITED STATES SENATE

ONE HUNDRED FIRST CONGRESS

SECOND SESSION

MARCH 30, 1990

Printed for the use of the Committee on Foreign Relations

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

29-866 *

WASHINGTON : 1990

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, Congressional Sales Office
U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, DC 20402

5381-13

## COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

CLAIBORNE PELL, Rhode Island, *Chairman*

| | |
|---|---|
| JOSEPH R. BIDEN, JR., Delaware | JESSE HELMS, North Carolina |
| PAUL S. SARBANES, Maryland | RICHARD G. LUGAR, Indiana |
| ALAN CRANSTON, California | NANCY L. KASSEBAUM, Kansas |
| CHRISTOPHER J. DODD, Connecticut | RUDY BOSCHWITZ, Minnesota |
| JOHN F. KERRY, Massachusetts | LARRY PRESSLER, South Dakota |
| PAUL SIMON, Illinois | FRANK H. MURKOWSKI, Alaska |
| TERRY SANFORD, North Carolina | MITCH McCONNELL, Kentucky |
| DANIEL P. MOYNIHAN, New York | GORDON J. HUMPHREY, New Hampshire |
| CHARLES S. ROBB, Virginia | CONNIE MACK, Florida |

GERYLD B. CHRISTIANSON, *Staff Director*
JAMES P. LUCIER, *Minority Staff Director*

---

### SUBCOMMITTEE ON NEAR EASTERN AND SOUTH ASIAN AFFAIRS

DANIEL P. MOYNIHAN, New York, *Chairman*

| | |
|---|---|
| CLAIBORNE PELL, Rhode Island | RUDY BOSCHWITZ, Minnesota |
| PAUL S. SARBANES, Maryland | NANCY L. KASSEBAUM, Kansas |
| CHARLES S. ROBB, Virginia | LARRY PRESSLER, South Dakota |

# CONTENTS


| | Page |
|---|---|
| Bialkin, Kenneth, President, Jewish Community Relations Council of New York | 32 |
| Bolton, John, Assistant Secretary of State, International Organization Affairs | 9 |
| Prepared statement | 14 |
| Joseph, Burton, Former Chairman, Anti-Defamation League | 57 |
| Prepared statement | 58 |
| Reich, Seymour D., Chairman, Conference of Presidents of the Major Jewish Organizations | 30 |


ADDENDA


| | |
|---|---|
| Anti-Sovietism: The Profession of the Zionists | 4 |
| Conference on Israel, Zionism, and the United Nations | 33 |
| Helms, Senator Jesse, prepared statement | 3 |
| Pell, Senator Claiborne, prepared statement | 2 |
| S.J. Resolution 205 | 9 |
| U.N. Resolution | 3 |
| U.N. Decree on Zionism, the (article), by William Korey | 27 |

# REVOKING THE U.N. ZIONISM RESOLUTION

FRIDAY, MARCH 30, 1990

U.S. SENATE,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON NEAR EASTERN
AND SOUTH ASIAN AFFAIRS
OF THE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS,
*Washington, DC.*

The subcommittee met, pursuant to notice, at 10:03 a.m. in room SD-419, Dirksen Senate Office Building, Hon. Daniel P. Moynihan (chairman of the subcommittee) presiding.

Present: Senators Simon, Moynihan, Boschwitz, and Pressler.

Senator MOYNIHAN. A very good morning to our witnesses and to our guests. This is a meeting of the Subcommittee on Near Eastern and South Asian Affairs of the Committee on Foreign Relations to consider Senate Joint Resolution 246 introduced by the distinguished Senator from Minnesota, Mr. Boschwitz, concerning United Nations Resolution 3379 of 1975 which declared Zionism to be a form of racism and which was perhaps the low point in the history of the behavior of the General Assembly and of the campaign led at that time by the Soviet Union to discredit both the nation of Israel, its principal allies and friends around the world and, in the process of doing so, to politicize, at a level heretofore unknown, the activities of the General Assembly. Those are essentially political activities in any event, but the Soviets chose to use them as instruments of totalitarian propaganda, distortion and lying that we came to associate with the totalitarian state.

It emerged in time that the Zionism resolution had its origins in a two-part article in Pravda written by the deputy foreign editor which appeared in 1971. With all of the trappings of an international propaganda campaign, within a week the article was published as a pamphlet and translated, I believe, into seven languages and began to make its way around international conferences.

It appeared at the International Women's Conference in Mexico City sponsored by the United Nations in the summer of 1975 and then, of course, appeared in Geneva at UNESCO and finally in the third committee of the General Assembly in 1975.

We have since read in a remarkable statement made by the Soviet Foreign Minister, Mr. Shevardnadze, that there was indeed a campaign of this kind, and it was waged on more than one front. In an address to the General Council of UNESCO in Paris about a year ago, Mr. Shevardnadze said of that high point of rhetorical violence and distortion in the 1970's that "we," meaning the Soviet Union, "submitted to this period of confrontation," and indeed they did.

He now has stated his regret that this happened, which I do not doubt is genuine enough because in the end it served no Soviet interest that I nor evidently he can perceive.

Still, it happened, and the issue is how to undo it. If there is to be any viable purpose of an institution such as the General Assembly, it cannot remain committed to as great a lie as was told in Pravda; to wit, for example, that the genocidal massacres at Babi Yar were not directed against Jews but, in fact, were a collaboration of the Zionist and the SS. That is typical of the inversion, the absolute inversion of the truth in totalitarian propaganda, and the General Assembly has committed itself to this infamous lie.

Country after country which comes to this committee begging with bowl in hand asking for help still remains committed to this lie, a lie which precludes any peaceable settlement in the Middle East, because while that lie is there it is an intolerable barrier to the legitimacy of any settlement.

The U.S. Congress holds to this view, as do some other institutions in democratic states and the world. In 1987 on the occasion of the visit to the United States of the President of Israel, Chaim Herzog, who in 1975 was the Permanent Representative of Israel to the United Nations, the Senate adopted a joint resolution which is a bill, a statute, which word for word repeated the language of a resolution earlier adopted by the Parliament of Australia calling for the repeal of this General Assembly resolution.

We had very much in mind that this Australian initiative, having taken place in a middle-sized democracy far from the region, gave it an authenticity which was valuable in itself. In any event, the Australians had begun the effort and we joined in.

We then hoped that our Nation would take this matter and pursue it through diplomatic channels in other countries. We are here to find out whether that was done. The evidence is very poor. We have heard no report from the State Department. We have learned nothing, formally or informally, and hence our inquiry.

Mr. Boschwitz cannot be with us this morning, but I have his statement which he would like to place in the record at this point and which I will so do.

[The prepared statements of Senator Pell and Senator Helms follow:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF SENATOR PELL

I am very pleased that Senator Moynihan is chairing a meeting of the Subcommittee on Near Eastern and South Asian Affairs to receive testimony on Senate Joint Resolution 246, which calls upon the United Nations to repeal the infamous U.N. General Assembly Resolution 3379.

U.N. General Assembly Resolution 3379, adopted nearly 15 years ago, declares that Zionism is a form of racism. This truly repugnant declaration stands out as an indelible blot on the record of the United Nations. It serves no other purpose than to bolster the standing of those who adhere to policies of division, of mendacity, of hate.

Senator Moynihan, our Ambassador to the U.N. at the time the resolution was adopted, has been particularly eloquent and tenacious in seeking the repudiation of this action. I commend Senator Moynihan for calling this timely and important hearing. It is my hope that this hearing and the Senate resolution we are discussing—which was approved unanimously by the full committee—will prompt new and sorely needed action to erase the despicable Zionism-is-racism equation.

I am pleased to join Senator Moynihan in welcoming our distinguished guests.

PREPARED STATEMENT OF SENATOR HELMS

Mr. Chairman, today's hearing focuses upon Senate Joint Resolution 246, the resolution reported out of this committee on March 6 that calls for the repeal of United Nations General Assembly Resolution 3379, which equated "Zionism with racism."

The chairman of this subcommittee already knows a great deal about this U.N. resolution. He led the U.S. opposition to the resolution in his capacity as U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations at that time.

The ranking member of this subcommittee, Mr. Boschwitz, introduced Senate Joint Resolution 246 calling for a repeal of the U.N. resolution. I am proud to be a cosponsor of Senator Boschwitz' resolution, and hope it will be passed promptly by the Senate.

The fact that the United Nations passed this resolution in the first place, and thus far has been unwilling to have it repealed, reminds us that the U.N. has turned into little more than a forum where the United States pays the bills for a bunch of Third World and Communist countries to beat up on the United States and our allies.

The State Department now wants the American taxpayer to fork over to the U.N. an additional $620 million in so-called arrearages. I question whether we should be funding this operation in the first place. But before we have the taxpayers start to throw in even more for these so-called arrearages, we should insist that offensive resolutions such as "Zionism is racism" be repealed, and that sufficient budgetary reforms have been implemented to reduce waste in U.N. operations.

Senator MOYNIHAN. We are honored by the presence of our most able and learned Senator from Illinois, Mr. Simon.

Senator SIMON. Thank you. I do not know whether I am either able or learned, but it is a pleasure to be here with you, Mr. Chairman.

At 10:30 a.m. I have to go to another meeting, but I wanted to be here at least for the opening of this session. It is very interesting. Constructive things are happening all over the world all of a sudden, in South Africa, in Eastern Europe, and I think constructive things can happen in the Middle East, too.

One of the ways we promote constructive things, too, is to deescalate all of the inflammatory language, and that U.N. resolution clearly is the kind of thing that does no one any good.

If we can under your leadership, Senator Moynihan, take another small step in deescalating inflammatory language and getting people to sit down and talk, that is in everyone's best interest. I commend you for your leadership. I am pleased to be a cosponsor.

Senator MOYNIHAN. Yes, you are a cosponsor.

Senator SIMON. I look forward to hearing our witnesses.

Senator MOYNIHAN. I thank you, sir.

I misspoke in one respect. Senator Boschwitz will be able to join us in a little bit.

I want to place also in the record at this time both the United Nations resolution, the Pravda article which is its origin, and the Joint Resolution passed by the Congress and signed by the President in 1987 which, to say again, is a statute.

[The information referred to follows:]

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

[on the report of the Third Committee (A/10320)/]

3379 (XXX). *Elimination of all forms of racial discrimination*

*The General Assembly,*

*Recalling* its resolution 1904 (XVIII) of 20 November 1963, proclaiming the United Nations Declaration on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, and in particular its affirmation that "any doctrine of racial differentiation or superiori-

ty is scientifically false, morally condemnable, socially unjust and dangerous" and its expression of alarm at "the manifestations of racial discrimination still in evidence in some areas in the world, some of which are imposed by certain Governments by means of legislative, administrative or other measures",

*Recalling also* that, in its resolution 3151 G (XXVIII) of 14 December 1973, the General Assembly condemned, *inter alia*, the unholy alliance between South African racism and Zionism,

*Taking note* of the Declaration of Mexico on the Equality of Women and their Contribution to Development and Peace,[1] proclaimed by the World Conference of the International Women's Year, held at Mexico City from 19 June to 2 July 1975, which promulgated the principle that "international cooperation and peace require the achievement of national liberation and independence, the elimination of colonialism and neo-colonialism, foreign occupation, Zionism, *apartheid* and racial discrimination in all its forms, as well as the recognition of the dignity of peoples and their right to self-determination",

*Taking note also* of resolution 77 (XII) adopted by the Assembly of Heads of State and Government of the Organization of African Unity at its twelfth ordinary session,[2] held at Kampala from 28 July to 1 August 1975, which considered "that the racist regime in occupied Palestine and the racist regimes in Zimbabwe and South Africa have a common imperialist origin, forming a whole and having the same racist structure and being organically linked in their policy aimed at repression of the dignity and integrity of the human being",

*Taking note also* of the Political Declaration and Strategy to Strengthen International Peace and Security and to Intensify Solidarity and Mutual Assistance among Non-Aligned Countries,[3] adopted at the Conference of Ministers for Foreign Affairs of Non-Aligned Countries held at Lima from 25 to 30 August 1975, which most severely condemned zionism as a threat to world peace and security and called upon all countries to oppose this racist and imperialist ideology,

*Determines* that zionism is a form of racism and racial discrimination.

---

[Pravda, Feb. 18–19, 1971]

## Anti-Sovietism: The Profession of the Zionists

(Translated by Christopher M. Cripps and Olga Shargorodska)

The logic of the social-economic development of two world systems—capitalist and socialist—foreordains the exacerbation of an ideological struggle between them. Imperialism brings into battle all of the new strengths from its diminishing reserves of the "conquerors of minds" and ideological saboteurs.

In this activity of imperialism, which is directed against socialism and the forces of progress, an evermore active role is played by the Zionist circles.

"Zionism," as emphasized in the theses of the Communist Party of Israel in "The Jewish Question and Zionism in Our Day," "serves as one of the weapons of imperialism in its global struggle and subversive political and ideological efforts against the U.S.S.R. and all of world socialist system—efforts directed at undermining the socialist regimes from within."

Zionism has joined forces with imperialism because of their common class essence. Contemporary Zionism is ideology, a well-developed system of organizations, and the political practice of the large Jewish bourgeoisie, integrally joined with the monopolistic circles of the U.S.A. and other imperialist powers. The fundamental substance of the politics of contemporary Zionism is blatant chauvinism, anticommunism, and anti-Sovietism.

The actions of Zionism are directed not only in support of Israel. The international Zionist corporation in the form of the World Zionist Organization (WZO), its "anteroom," the World Jewish Congress, and other numerous offshoots and affiliates represent one of the greatest combinations of financial capital and an international espionage center and service of disinformation and slander.

Characteristically, among those who now systematically finance the activities of Zionist organizations in the entire world, who subsidize the arms race in Israel, as well as the military adventures of that government, we find financial aces of various nationalities.

---

[1] E/5725, part one, sect. I.
[2] See A/10297, annex II.
[3] A/10217 and Corr. 1, annex, p. 3.

Capital is cosmopolitan. its owners are not united by concerns about their "blood brothers," but, in the first place, by their mutual class interests.

Tracing the interconnections of great monopoly capital groups, we see how closely their interests are interwoven. The Bank of the Lazare Freres divides gains from Near East oil with the groups of the Rockefellers, Morgans, and Cune, Loeb and Co., and closely cooperates with the West German smart operators and bankers through a system of shares in various enterprises of Israel. Mutual profits predetermine their mutual resulting passion for greed and hatred for the peoples of the Arabic countries which produce oil and are striving to deal with their own wealth—just as the loss of capital resulting from the October Revolution united the Rothchilds and Rockefellers and caused their hatred of Soviet power. Futile hopes to retrieve what is lost forever, "fears of a chain reaction of Bolshevism," compelled them to finance the intervention against the Soviet Union, and now impels them to lavishly finance the subversive work of the Zionists against the Soviet Union and other socialist countries.

"Politics, said V.I. Lenin, "is the most concentrated expression of economics." It is in this that causes of the anticommunism, anti-Soviet purposes of Zionism, as well as the political activity and ideology of the big business Jewish bourgeoisie, should be sought.

Zionist ideologists, and particularly V. Zhabotinskiy, who was born in Russia (the founder of the reactionary party, Herut, who after death was idolized by the fascist Jewish Defense League) tried in all ways to conceal the class nature of Zionism. In his major work, "Jewish State," Zhabotinskiy wrote, "We do not recognize any evaluation of Zionism from the class point of view—be it proletarian or, bourgeoisie. One has to remember once and forever that the movement for the rebirth of the Jewish people will not consider any class outlook." These words date from 1936. But to this day Zionist ideologists have never tired of emphasizing that, "All principal positions of Zhabotinskiy remain unchanged, and all of his calls are absolutely correct today and for the future as they were for the past."

Naum Goldman spoke openly of this as president of the World Zionist Organization in March 1964: "We must conduct a face-to-face struggle with the non-Jewish world and even within the Jewish community for our right to live as a isolated minority, as a minority not identified with any regime or any country. We must direct the Jewish people with our efforts, in our struggle for our special right to remain the same Jewish people that we have been over the course of thousands of years, a people united around our created center in Israel * * *"

Following the dogma of its founding fathers, Zionist ideology today acts under the flag of a class peace between exploiters and exploited; between Jewish millionaires on one side and the poor and unemployed on the other. Having proclaimed massive emigration to Palestine (now Israel) as the only possibility of solving the "Jewish question," Zionists tried and are trying now to falsely set apart Jews from other nations and peoples, by presenting themselves as "chosen" people.

In contemporary conditions this line is basically not a geographic isolation, but rather a social-political and ideological one. "Zionism," as is emphasized in the aforementioned theses of the Communist Party of Israel, "rejects the possibility of change in the situation of Jews as a result of their inclusion in the struggle of the workers and masses for democracy and socialism; it acts in order to tear them away from the social struggle against the sickness of capitalist society, including the struggle against anti-Semitism."

The class interests of the bourgeoisie in such a direction of the work of the Zionists among the Jewish workers is completely obvious. For this very reason, from their very first steps the Zionists received complete support from the leading imperialist forces. They were used for the purposes of the English colonialists and the German Kaiser in Tsarist Russia such arch reactionary political figures such as Pleve, Stolypin, and then Kerensky in the civil war—and the white guards and Petlyurovists. The Zionists did not disdain direct cooperation with them; striving to hold the Jewish masses in their subjugation—not allowing their participation in the revolution, in the struggle for Soviet power and socialism.

On May 2, 1918, in Moscow a secret conference of the "Centro-Zion," then one of the active Zionist organizations in Russia, was held. A program of a specific plan against communism was adopted. In it, in particular, is written: "Socialism stands in the path of Zionism. Thus, Zionism and socialism are not only two like poles, but two elements which are completely exclusive of each other * * *"

From the first days of its existence Soviet power led a struggle against the Zionist underground, which was acting hand in hand with the counterrevolutionaries. Such a policy of the Soviet Government was determined not by "anti-Semitic Bolsheviks," about whom loudly—and no less noisily today—the Zionists trumpeted. In reality

they literally sought among the Bolsheviks and within Soviet power some sort of appearances of anti-Semitism, and went into a frenzy because their searches were unsuccessful. It couldn't have been any other way. The national policy of the Bolsheviks to its core was antithetical to anti-Semitism as it was to any nationalism in general. V. Zhabotinskiy wrote as early as 1905 that, "As an argument for Zionist agitation, anti-Semitism, especially "raised to a principle," of course, is comfortable and useful. Thus, Zhabotinskiy, provoking anti-Semitism, closely cooperated in those years with Petlyupa. Thus, the Zionists joined forces with the "government" of Denikin, Hetman Sfioropadskiy, Petlyura, and created a Zionist military sub-units, which took up arms against the country of the Soviets.

Anti-Semitism was useful for the Zionists, who considered it the best means to force Jewish workers to fall into their embrace—in escape from pogroms—and emigrate to Palestine, the Colonization of which by that time was already fully underway in accordance with the plan of the international Zionist concern. These plans were helped by the Denikinists, Petlyurists, the bands of Bulak-Bulakovich and Makhno. From 1918 through 1921 they led on their captured territories 1,520 pogroms during which tens of thousands of Jews were tortured and killed. Only soviet power delivered the Jews from their sufferings, removing the White Guards and nationalist bands along with their Zionist hangers-on.

Jewish workers actively supported the great October socialist revolution and the cause of building socialism in our country. This preordained the crisis of Zionism in the Soviet Union and helped to liquidate the Zionist underground.

The Zionist service record includes cooperation with the most unbridled reactionaries like Petlyupa and Denikin, and others. The agents of the Zionist concern stained themselves by a dirty alliance with the Hitlerites when they were active during the war years in Western and Eastern European countries, and on the then occupied territories of the Soviet Union. Not a few instances are known when the Gestapo selected a cappo in the concentration camps from among the Zionists and special "police" that policed the Jewish ghetto. The "Tragedy of Babi Yar," as some Soviet citizens of Jewish descent now living in the Ukraine wrote to Pravda, will forever remain the embodiment not only of the cannibalism of Hitlerites, but also of irremovable disgrace for their collaborators and descendants, the Zionists.

Fascism was defeated. Once again the Soviet Army saved this time millions of Jews from annihilation. And for this, as paradoxical as it sounds, the Zionists could not forgive socialism. But their propagandistic pretension to the role saviors of the Jewish people, their millions of selfadvertisements could not wipe away peoples' memories of the feat of the Soviet soldiers who put out the fires of the Ritlerite death factories.

After the war, the Zionists cams completely under the control of big business in the U.S.A. After the creation of the state of Israel, on August 5, 1952 in the Israeli newspaper "El-Hamismar" an "explanation" appeared on the occasion of the pro-American declaration by the then Minister of Foreign Affairs of Israel, M. Sharett; this is what it says verbatim, "the active participation of jews of the U.S. in the building of our state depends on how the foreign policy of Israel will be integrated into Washington's global policy. Our Jewish brothers across the ocean will not help us if do not submit to the will of their government."

The submission turned out to be total. The branches of the international Zionist concern in Israel and other countries of the so-called "free world" became active conductors of the reactionary foreign policy course in the United States that distinguished itself in the years of the Cold War by Dulles-type aggressiveness and undisguised anticommunism. This completely satisfied Zionist leaders whose hatred for socialism was only increased by the fact that in the East European countries, after the establishment of the peoples' power, they could not continue their subversive activities without being punished.

The subversive activity of Zionists against international communism and the workers' movement and against socialist countries, became especially hysterical during the period of preparation for the June Israeli aggression against neighboring Arab countries, and became more active after the majority of socialist countries severed diplomatic relations with Israel.

In December of 1967 a Tel Aviv newspaper, "Haaretz," wrote—puffing with self-importance—that Israel (that is, Zionism) has a great capacity to inflict a strike on socialist countries in Eastern Europe. The London correspondent of this newspaper, hidden under the pseudonym Alif Shim, suggests the creation of "difficulties" in the socialist camp by means of inflaming the Jewish populations in socialist countries with nationalistic feelings—using for this purpose means of mass information that are subservient to imperialism, in the first place radio and television. He wrote in

particular that, "Israel must play the role of a thorn in the body of the communist movement around which eventually an inflammation will form."

There is nothing accidental in the fact that the political and ideological activation of Zionism against the Soviet Union and other socialist countries coincided with the adoption by the United States foreign policy strategists of the "theory of bridge-building"

The first practical application of this theory and the policy based upon it was described by Gus Hall, the General Secretary of the Communist Party of the U.S.A., as a means of "creating underground ideological tunnels," the first result of which were the events of 1968 in Czechoslovakia.

According to the scenario of "The Quiet Revolution," written in the U.S.A. at the Hudson Institute, the international Zionist concern had not a minor role in the events of 1968 in the CSSR. One of its tasks, in particular, was to take over the press and other means of mass communication in Czechoslovakia. The Zionist center was in charge of this operation.

The Zionists strove to take over the leadership in all of the spheres of mass communication in the CSSR in order to conduct frenetic propaganda against the socialist system in Czechoslovakia, against the CPC, the Soviet Union, the CPSU, and the communist parties of the brother socialist countries. Concurrently, Zionist elements helped the imperialist secret services in gathering intelligence information.

On May 30, 1968, a certain A. Bramberg came to the CSSR with documents of the American information agency, USIA, and met in the Prague hotel, "Alkron," with Arnosht Lustic, a "writer" now based in Israel. It was about that Ladislav Nobomerskiy spoke sarcastically while appearing at the May 1968 Conference of Slovak Writers. Be characterized the blabbering of Lustic and his "Czech" television colleagues as openly pro-Israel and pro- Zionist, and noted that they appeared not as writers but as experienced experts on the question of Israel.

With the help of Lustic, meetings were arranged for Bramberg in the headquarters of "Literarny Listy" with the then leadership of the Czech Writers Union headed by the Zionist E.Gol'dshtukker. He then visited the Czechoslovak Academy of Sciences. Among Bramberg's documents, it is noted in the materials of the MVD CSSR (Ministry of Internal Affairs), was private information about the economic conditions in Czechoslovakia and an analysis of the situation in the Czech army and security organs.

Included in this subversive activity against the socialist system in the CSSR were numerous Zionist organizations from the WZO and the World Jewish Congress to the "World Congress of Jewish Journalists."

At this time the "Committee of Czechoslovak Refugees" in Vienna and the "Center for the Coordination of the Fighters for Freedom in Czechoslovakia" were active. This affiliate was directly involved in fund raising for the publication of the newspaper "Literarny Listy," the mouthpiece of the counterrevolutionaries of Czechoslovakia. As the Israeli "Maarii" wrote, donations were to be sent to the following address: Discount Bank, No. 450055, Tel Aviv.

During the preparation of the counterrevolutionary coup in CSSR, Zionist espionage conducted active propaganda for the restoration of diplomatic relations between Czechoslovakia and Israel. No small role in this campaign is attributed to Gol'dshtukker, Shik and Krigel.

After the request of many thousands of Czechoslovak communists, including the members of the Central Committee of the CPC and the government of the CSSR, the military forces of five countries—the members of the Warsaw Pact—provided international assistance to the brother Czech people in their struggle against counterrevolution. The Zionist underground then turned to illegal methods of struggle. At many secret radio stations on the territory of the CSSR that were in those days spreading slander against socialism, many frenetic Zionists worked, including Israeli "consultants."

The failure of the plot of international reaction in Czechoslovakia destroyed the long-term plans of American imperialism and its Zionist henchmen. In Washington the advocates of "bridge building" closed ranks with the advocates of the "sharp course" in relations with the soviet Union and other socialist countries. The winds of the "Cold War," emanating from the American capital, fanned the sails of Zionist propaganda. Not disdaining to export "quiet counterrevolution" to the socialist countries, the international Zionist concern simultaneously developed the plans of a broad anti-Soviet campaign. They started the new "campaign against Bolshevism" under the ragged standard of "defending Jews" living in the U.S.S.R. and other socialist countries. These activities went as far as attempts at open terrorism against Soviet citizens working abroad.

Concurrent with provocative, terrorist excursions, calculated on broad publicity and ongoing propagation of anti-Semitism, the international Zionist concern organized attempts at direct interference in the internal affairs of the Soviet Union unconcealed subversive espionage activity. The activities of the "Jewish Defense League" are not the only examples of this.

Recently 26 Zionist organizations of the U.S.A. put together a group under the appellation, "American Conference on the State of Soviet Jews," which was headed by Rabbi Hershel Shakhter. The "conference" finds broad support in rightist circles in both Israel and in the U.S.A. Shortly before the beginning of 1971, its leaders, Skakhter and Max Fisher, Chairman of the Council of Jewish Federations and philanthropic funds, were received in the White House by President Nixon. About the nature of this "conference" one can decide from its unbridled propaganda campaign directed against the U.S.S.R. which is conducted through all possible channels.

The hatred of socialism by the Zionists, their role as saboteurs in the war of ideas, which is led by imperialism against socialism, resounds today from all Zionist halls, calling forth an anti-Soviet battle. In this war the Zionist leaders are attempting to discredit the appearance of socialism, its ideas in the eyes of the workers of the capitalist countries, and, to a certain degree, shake the communist conviction of the workers in the socialist countries.

Over the past several years, with the help of tourists, certain Western journalists accredited in the U.S.S.R., businessmen and students, the international Zionist concern has attempted to arrange an underground supply of Zionist literature in Russian in the Soviet Union—to establish something of a Zionist underground.

Pocket-size brochures that are finely printed on very thin paper contain the most vile slander about the policies of the Soviet Government. Anonymous "well-wishers," claiming the right to speak "in the name of all Jews,"—an old worn-out and immutable trick in the arsenal of Zionism—attempt to blacken our social structure, our reality.

They not only slander but instruct; for example, the anonymous Zionist paper, "Home!": "The war must be conducted by all means—from anonymous letters from the West to open appearances." They are concerned not only with the recruitment of new supporters, but are also in a hurry to introduce the uninitiated to the Zionist charter. "The main principle of the ongoing work of the Zionists," as is discussed in one of the brochures, is very simple: "A Zionist must be a Zionist in every step of his life. During every major and minor event in his life he must investigate and attempt to use the event for the goods of our cause. No meeting or stroll should be wasted."

It is not difficult to guess about the goal of the "cause" which concerns the Zionists. The Israeli secret service (an integral part of the international Zionist center—V.B.) directs significant efforts—as the military correspondent of the New York Times, Baldwin, explains—toward intelligence gathering of military, political and economic nature in socialist countries, in particular in the Soviet Union. Western "experts" have grudgingly admitted, however, that in the U.S.S.R. only a limited number of renegades fall into the net of the Zionist espionage service. Our press has been writing about one of them, Solomon Dol'nik, who was arrested on May 26, 1966 and convicted of anti-Soviet activities. What led Dol'nik to treachery! In the course of the investigation it was discovered that the reason for his degradation was continuous contacts with employees of the Israeli embassy, which was operating in Moscow before the severing of diplomatic relations with Israel. Dol'nik underwent intensive Zionist cultivation: they planted the thought that his homeland was not the Soviet Union, but Israel. This method of recruitment is common for the Israeli secret service. A person converted to the Zionist faith automatically becomes an agent of the international Zionist concern and hence, the enemy of the Soviet people.

It is sufficient to notice who stands behind the publication of the Zionist brochures in Russian that were mentioned earlier. It is, in particular, Brooklyn millionaire Bernard Deutch. This is the same Deutch who foot the bill for the fascist Zionist party, "Herut," in its efforts "for great Israel." He lavishly finances the propagandistic travels of such renegades and traitors as D.Sperling and Ya.Kazakov in the U.S.A. Deutch is not simply a philanthropist and Zionist and anti-Soviet, he is a committed fascist, a pathological "ultra," connections with whom are not advertized by "respectable" Zionist organizations. And this is understandable: Deutsh, Kahane and other Zionists of their ilk stink of the CIA and other espionage and saboteur organizations of imperialism.

Nevertheless, both the "respectable" and hooligan Zionist organizations do the same dirty work—the difference is only in tactics. Now they are busy throwing together the "World Jewish Defense League," preparing at full speed for an intensive

"international" anti-Soviet orgy, the international Zionist Conference "in defense of Soviet Jews"(!), which is scheduled to be held in Brussels form the 23rd through the 25th of February.

The conference, according to the plan of its organizers,—WJC, the World Jewish Congress, Bnai Brith and others—must become a turning point in the broad anti-Soviet campaign that has been underway far the last 2 years. This is yet another insolent attempt to directly interfere in the internal affairs of the U.S.S.R.

Zionist psychological attacks of this kind call forth the justified indignation of all Soviet people, both Jews and non-Jews. Because the Zionist band dirtied itself in particular by the bloody crimes during the war with the Hitlerites and on the occupied Arab territories, the Soviet people will never recognize the right of the Zionist gang to speak for Soviet citizens of Jewish descent. One can only be perplexed that these Zionist "pretensions" find support in the government circles of the U.S.A., Belgium and other countries where Zionist storm troopers are active.

It shall be made clear once and for all to the Zionists that Zionism does not and will not have a place in our Soviet society.

S.J. RESOLUTION 205—PUBLIC LAW 100-169—NOVEMBER 17, 1987

Expressing the sense of the Congress that United Nations General Assembly Resolution 3379 (XXX) should be overturned, and for other purposes.

*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That the Congress hereby—

(1) declares that United Nations General Assembly Resolution 3379 (XXX), which equates Zionism with racism—

(A) has been unhelpful in the context of the search for a settlement in the Middle East;

(B) is inconsistent with the Charter of the United Nations;

(C) remains unacceptable as a misrepresentation of Zionism; and

(D) has served to escalate religious animosity and incite anti-Semitism; and

(2) recommends that the United States Government should lend support to efforts to overturn Resolution 3379 (XXX) in the United Nations.

Approved November 17, 1987.

Senator MOYNIHAN. Finally, I would record that the Australian resolution has now been adopted by six other parliamentary bodies or representative bodies, our Congress, of course, and the Belgian, Netherlands, Uruguay, Peru, and the European Parliament.

With that, we are happy to call to the witness table the Honorable John Bolton, who is Assistant Secretary of State for International Organization Affairs. Our witness list says that Mr. Thomas Pickering, our U.S. Permanent Representative to the United Nations, should also be here. He evidently is not. Mr. Bolton will no doubt explain that to us.

Mr. Secretary, we welcome you, and you can proceed.

## STATEMENT OF JOHN BOLTON, ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE, INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION AFFAIRS

Mr. BOLTON. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. It is a pleasure to be here today. I have a prepared statement which, with your permission, I will submit for the record and read a somewhat shorter statement.

Senator MOYNIHAN. It will be placed in the record as if read.

Mr. BOLTON. Thank you.

We regret very much that Ambassador Pickering is not available to be here this morning. We have events in New York that, as I am sure you can understand——

Senator MOYNIHAN. Ambassador Pickering is in New York?

Mr. BOLTON. Yes, that is correct.

Senator MOYNIHAN. I see.

Mr. BOLTON. As I mentioned to you before the hearing began, we hope to have a brief statement for the record that he would have submitted to the committee had he been here.

Mr. Chairman, this administration——

Senator MOYNIHAN. There is no statement from Mr. Pickering, then?

Mr. BOLTON. There is not at this point. We are still going through the clearance process, but we have to have it cleared in a very short time.

Senator MOYNIHAN. The clearance process?

Mr. BOLTON. The bureaucratic process in which we engage in the State Department to get our words carved in stone so that everybody agrees on them. That is still in process, unfortunately, but we will have it to you as soon as we can.

Senator MOYNIHAN. So noted.

Mr. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, this administration vigorously opposes Resolution 3379 and all that it stands for. As our permanent representative in 1975 put it after that vote, the United States of America declares that it does not acknowledge it, will not abide by it, and will never acquiesce in this infamous act.

The resolution is a fundamental contradiction in terms and constitutes a violation of basic U.N. principles. Political Zionism is the lawful embodiment of the Jewish national movement that was recognized when the United Nations established the modern state of Israel. The General Assembly cannot validly adopt contradictory resolutions such as this.

On May 22, 1989, Secretary Baker in a major speech on the Middle East called on the Arab world to "repudiate the odious line that Zionism is racism."

On December 10, 1989, Vice President Quayle publicly called for repeal of Resolution 3379 in his speech at Yeshiva University in New York.

The administration welcomes Congress' active interest in seeking to overturn Resolution 3379 expressed in the joint resolution of November 17, 1987, and we are, of course, aware of another joint resolution which you and Senator Boschwitz and many others have cosponsored.

During the interval after adoption of the joint resolution of Congress and the General Assembly in 1988, the United States consulted with several of our allies, Israel and key Arab countries about the possibility of overturning the resolution. The consensus, including the view of Israel, was that at the time it then was not opportune to seek repeal. Our discussions with Israel and the League of Arab States last year produced a similar conclusion.

If I could for this year, Mr. Chairman, address the political context that we face in the United Nations system.

Since the Bush administration entered office last year, opponents of the state of Israel have continued their campaign to utilize the U.N. system to Israel's disadvantage. Building on the repeated efforts of Israel opponents in prior years, challenging Israeli credentials in the General Assembly, obtaining observer organization status for the PLO, and then changing the PLO's nameplate to

"Palestine" in December 1988, a new strategy against Israel emerged early last year.

The PLO and its supporters launched a U.N. systemwide effort to attain the status of member state for the PLO in these agencies. Now the PLO fails to satisfy the generally accepted criteria for statehood under international law and is, therefore, not eligible to join as a member state any of the international organizations to which it applied. The PLO's campaign actually undercuts the substantive work of the U.N. specialized agencies in areas administered by Israel.

Following an extensive lobbying campaign in Geneva, Washington, and virtually all foreign capitals, Secretary Baker made it clear in his May 1 statement that we oppose the PLO's efforts as a matter of principle and that the inevitable result of any enhancement of the PLO status in an international organization would be the complete termination of United States funding for that organization.

Mr. Chairman, there is not the slightest doubt in my mind that Secretary Baker's firm and unequivocal statement and the support in Congress for that view made the difference, enabling us to gain a deferral of the PLO's membership application in every agency to which it applied.

In last fall's General Assembly, however, the PLO shifted away from an application for membership as a state, seeking instead to enhance its status as an observer to that of an observer state such as Switzerland and the Holy See and the Koreas. The PLO even sought to have its chair on the assembly floor moved next to those used by the existing observer states to demonstrate some kind of enhanced status because it was getting closer to where the states sat.

I am pleased to report that when the 45th General Assembly convenes this fall, the PLO will still be on square one.

Our analysis of the many positive developments taking place in Eastern Europe and Central America has led us to believe that the time was ripe to consider whether we and other like-minded governments should attempt to repeal "Zionism is racism."

I want to stress to the committee that we have been in close consultation with the Israeli Government on this issue and will remain so. The position of the Government of Israel on this very question was recently addressed at the highest levels of the foreign ministry, and it is as follows.

Israel stands unreservedly for the repeal of the Zionism is racism resolution. At the same time, the Government of Israel wants to be certain that any effort to repeal the resolution should succeed comfortably. A moral victory of almost repealing the resolution would not be a satisfactory solution to Israel even if the number of votes in support of its position was substantially higher than in 1975.

With this in mind, Mr. Chairman, we have begun to explore diplomatically the possible strategies and tactics for repeal of the resolution.

First, we are consulting with the 35 countries that joined the United States in opposing the resolution in 1975 to reiterate our belief that the resolution should be rescinded, urging their support

for repeal and soliciting their views regarding coordination on appropriate strategy and timing.

Second, we are consulting with numerous countries which originally voted for the resolution but which have subsequently acquired new governments and new thinking. For example, just this week the Polish Prime Minister told a dinner of the American Jewish Congress that he condemned the U.N. resolution as an attempt to foster hatred of Jews, and I might note that in the prepared statement there are several other quotations from new leaders evidencing the same point of view.

Senator MOYNIHAN. From Mr. Havel.

Mr. BOLTON. Mr. Havel is another; that is correct.

Third, Mr. Chairman, we are consulting with countries which either abstained or were absent in 1975 or which joined the United Nations after that date, some 29 in number.

Finally, we are consulting with Arab governments making the same points which Vice President Quayle and Secretary Baker have effectively made. Repeal would help facilitate the peace process by sending a clear signal to Israel that the Arab side is ready for reconciliation and thereby reassure Israel about Arab intentions.

We still have much to do in our consultations. At this early date, therefore, predictions would be uncertain, at best. I can say, however, that we see distinct signs of movement by several governments which originally voted in favor of Resolution 3379 to positions either opposing the concept that Zionism is racism or at least likely abstaining in a vote.

Among the countries which abstained, did not vote or were not members of the U.N. in 1975, we have seen similar movement toward opposing the concept that underlies the resolution. Moreover, within this category we have seen no retrograde movement toward supporting the resolution.

Finally, the 35 nations which courageously opposed Resolution 3379 in 1975 appear to be remaining steadfast.

Senator MOYNIHAN. Mr. Secretary, it took no courage to oppose that resolution. It was a filthy Soviet lie. What was the courage involved? In what jeopardy did a nation put itself by standing for an elemental truth in opposition to a disastrous and despicable untruth?

Mr. BOLTON. I agree with every characterization you have made of the resolution. I think, as we saw this past year——

Senator MOYNIHAN. Did the Soviets cut off aid to those countries that did not vote with it?

Mr. BOLTON. Not that I know of, Mr. Chairman.

Senator MOYNIHAN. Did we cut off aid to those countries that did?

Mr. BOLTON. Not that I know of, Mr. Chairman.

Senator MOYNIHAN. Do not say, "Not that I know." The answer is "No."

The point is that the West imposed no consequences of any kind on those nations that associated themselves with this filthy proposition from the Soviet Union.

Mr. BOLTON. Why not strike the word "courageously" then from the testimony.

Senator MOYNIHAN. Yes, let us strike the word "courageous."

Mr. BOLTON. Having said all that I said before, Mr. Chairman, the colloquy about the results of our early consultations, I need hardly tell a committee of the Congress that any legislative proposal is easier to draft than it is to steer to final passage. I can assure the committee that we have given and will continue to give careful consideration to the strategy and tactics that will at the appropriate moment ensure the repeal of this odious resolution.

For obvious reasons I would prefer not to make our game plans public, but I would be more than happy to keep the committee closely informed as the fall approaches.

As you mentioned, Mr. Chairman, in 1975 the Soviet Union led the General Assembly in adopting Resolution 3379. We hope that recent Soviet cooperation throughout the U.N. system could be expanded to obtain repeal of that resolution. Several discussions that we have held with the Soviets at the U.N. in Moscow and here in Washington on the issue of Zionism is racism unfortunately have failed to produce agreement for a concerted approach toward repealing the resolution.

We want our new cooperation with the Soviets to go forward and do not want to see the Soviets take steps such as in Lithuania that could affect our ability to do so. So, our dialog with the Soviet Union continues. The Soviets have assured us that the resolution represents a concept that is no longer acceptable according to the new political thinking of the Soviet Union.

Senator MOYNIHAN. That is an important statement, Mr. Secretary. The Soviets have stated that that resolution represents a principle no longer acceptable to them, a view no longer held by them.

Mr. BOLTON. That is correct.

Senator MOYNIHAN. I am not trying to ask you to describe the diplomatic discussions, but I have not heard this before, and you have just said it. Obviously, you felt free to do so. Have they said it publicly?

Mr. BOLTON. They have said it somewhat more obliquely in public along with their further assertion that they do not consider the time is ripe to raise it again. They have characterized——

Senator MOYNIHAN. It is a filthy lie but not to be repudiated?

Mr. BOLTON. That is not the way they put it, but their statement was that they consider it to be gathering dust in the archive shelves. I explained on several occasions——

Senator MOYNIHAN. So is the information that Stalin murdered 20,000 Polish officers in the Katyn Forest, but they exhumed that fact 2 weeks ago.

Mr. BOLTON. We are continuing to work——

Senator MOYNIHAN. I mean, there is a process going on in the Soviet Union of exhumation—which is not too strong a word—of reporting what actually happened. Is it beyond our ability to find out how they produced this resolution? I think I know how. With the failure of the 1967 war and then the 1973 war, to destroy Israel they turned to an effort to delegitimatize it.

Senator Simon.

Senator SIMON. May I interrupt?

Senator MOYNIHAN. Sir, you are not interrupting.

29-866 0 - 90 - 2

Senator SIMON. Just one question.

At what level has this been discussed with the Soviets? Has this been at the Secretarial level, at the Presidential level?

Mr. BOLTON. So far, it has been at my level with my Soviet opposite number, a Deputy Foreign Minister.

Senator SIMON. I would think this is significant enough and important enough as a signal to everyone that it ought to be brought up at a higher level, meaning no disrespect to you here now. I think if you could convey that at least one member, and my guess is that at least two members———

Senator MOYNIHAN. My guess is the full Committee on Foreign Relations.

Senator SIMON. Yes—that there is a feeling here that that ought to be done. I think that is important. I think it is important, among other things, also, for what is happening internally in the Soviet Union in terms of anti-Semitism and the growth of anti-Semitism there. I think we need every possible signal that we want to move away from that kind of conduct.

Mr. BOLTON. I can assure you, Senator, that we have discussed this precise question on several occasions with Secretary Baker, and he is in complete agreement with our position. I will certainly convey your opinion back to him and factor that in as part of our overall diplomatic efforts.

Obviously, the Vice President, having said it publicly, did not say it directly to the Soviets but made very clear what the administration point of view was and conveyed that as well the day after his speech in New York to Secretary General Perez de Cuellar, so it was quite well known in the community in New York.

Mr. BOLTON. To conclude, Mr. Chairman, I welcome this opportunity to review the administration's policy and approach toward repealing United Nations General Assembly Resolution 3379. We continue to oppose the resolution vigorously and all that it stands for.

We are consulting with Israel and other countries which share our desire to see the resolution repealed. We believe that there is a strong opposition to the resolution by a large and growing number of U.N. member countries. With this in mind we are taking action and will intensify our efforts during the 1990 session of the General Assembly.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Obviously I would be more than happy to answer any other questions that you might have.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Bolton follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF MR. JOHN R. BOLTON

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to appear before this committee on the subject of United Nations General Assembly Resolution 3379, which condemned Zionism as a form of racism. I want to share with you the administration's plans to effect repeal of the resolution, what the reactions of other countries have been, and how we view the prospects for overturning this obnoxious General Assembly resolution.

This administration's position regarding Resolution 3379 is clear and unequivocal. We vigorously oppose the resolution and all that it stands for. As our Permanent Representative in 1975 put it after the vote: "The United States of America declares that it does not acknowledge it, will not abide by it, and will never acquiesce in this infamous act."

The resolution is a fundamental contradiction in terms, and constitutes a violation of basic U.N. principles. Political Zionism is the lawful embodiment of the

Jewish national movement that was recognized when the United Nations established the modern state of Israel. The General Assembly cannot validly adopt contradictory resolutions such as this.

On May 22, 1989, Secretary Baker—in a major speech on the Middle East—called on the Arab world to "repudiate the odious line that Zionism is racism." On December 10, 1989, Vice President Quayle publicly called for repeal of Resolution 3379 in his speech at Yeshiva University in New York.

The administration welcomes Congress' active interest in seeking to overturn Resolution 3379, expressed in the joint resolution of November 17, 1987. We understand that you are considering passage of another joint resolution in this regard.

During the interval after adoption of the joint resolution of Congress and the General Assembly in 1988, the United States consulted with several of our allies, Israel and key Arab countries about the possibility of overturning the resolution. The consensus, including the view of Israel, was that the time was not opportune to seek reversal. Our discussions with Israel and the League of Arab States last year produced a similar conclusion.

POLITICAL CONTEXT

Since the Bush administration entered office last year, opponents of the State of Israel have continued their campaign to utilize the U.N. system to Israel's disadvantage. These opponents have attempted to politicize the specialized agencies and prejudice the Middle East peace process by illegitimate efforts to discredit Israel in a variety of ways. Throughout, the Bush administration—with broad and deep bipartisan support from both Houses of Congress—has consistently opposed such efforts.

Building on the repeated efforts of Israel's opponents in prior years, challenging Israeli credentials in the United Nations General Assembly, obtaining observer organization status for the PLO, and then changing the PLO's nameplate to "Palestine" in December 1988, a new strategy against Israel emerged early last year. The PLO and its supporters launched a U.N. systemwide effort—in plain violation of the provisions of the constitutions of various specialized agencies of the U.N.—to obtain the status of member "state" for the PLO in these agencies.

As we have said in the debates on this subject, the PLO fails to satisfy the generally accepted criteria for "statehood" under international law, and is, therefore, not eligible to join as a member state any of the international organizations to which it applied. Moreover, the PLO's campaign actually undercuts the substantive work of the U.N.'s specialized agencies in areas administered by Israel.

The issue of PLO membership arose first at the World Health Assembly in May 1988. At that time, we also heard reports that the PLO was considering membership applications to the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO), the International Labor Organization (ILO), the International Telecommunication Union (ITU), the U.N. Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), and the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA). We also heard of a possible attempt by the PLO to accede to the four Geneva Conventions.

Following an extensive lobbying campaign in Geneva, Washington, and virtually all foreign capitals, Secretary Baker made it clear in his May 1 statement that: (1) we opposed the PLO's efforts as a matter of principle; and (2) the inevitable result of any enhancement of the PLO's status in an international organization would be the complete termination of U.S. funding for that organization. There is not the slightest doubt in my mind that Secretary Baker's firm and unequivocal statement, and the support in Congress for that view, made the difference in the World Health Organization (WHO), enabling us to gain a deferral of the PLO's membership application.

I was privileged to have led the U.S. delegation's efforts to carry out Secretary Baker's instructions at the World Health Assembly. And, we were ultimately successful, although this result was far from a foregone conclusion. Only by obtaining secret ballots on several key votes were we able to provide cover for many member governments to vote their consciences without fear of retaliation. We had to overcome heavy lobbying by the PLO's strongest supporters, the Governments of Cuba, Libya, and Sandanista Nicaragua.

UNESCO agreed to defer the PLO's application, although numerous efforts were made to enhance the PLO's status through devices other than formal membership. After the PLO's application was deferred, I went immediately to UNESCO's headquarters in Paris to meet with Director General Federico Mayor. I made it clear to the Director General that the admission of the PLO as a member state in UNESCO would effectively preclude any further consideration of whether the United States would ever rejoin UNESCO.

We also made our opposition to PLO membership clear to the leadership of the other agencies where the PLO had threatened to apply. Despite PLO representations to a number of Western nations after their defeat at the World Health Assembly, that their membership campaign was being "frozen," the PLO reappeared throughout the summer and fall. The PLO filed a membership application to the World Tourism Organization (an institution not part of the U.N. system). The PLO's efforts were narrowly defeated by a joint deferral resolution that I offered on behalf of the United States, Australia, and Hungary. Once again, obtaining a secret ballot was critical to the success of our efforts.

The PLO tried the same approach in the FAO, seeking to become a vehicle for implementing FAO programs in the occupied territories, and thus implying some sort of enhanced status for the PLO.

This brings us to last fall's U.N. General Assembly. There, it shifted away from an application for membership as a state, seeking instead to enhance its status as an observer to that of an "observer state" (like Switzerland or the Koreas). As noted above, as the PLO had in some of the U.N.'s specialized agencies, the PLO sought recognition of its "statehood" in a variety of different ways, all of which were ultimately rejected. At the General Assembly, this even included efforts by the PLO to have its chair on the Assembly floor moved next to those used by the existing observer states. The PLO hoped to argue that its "statehood" had been at least tacitly recognized by the General Assembly. I am pleased to report that when the 45th General Assembly convenes this fall the PLO will still be on square one.

TAKING THE OFFENSIVE

During the time we have been dealing with the PLO issue, and since, enormous changes have been taking place in Eastern Europe and Latin America. In Eastern Europe, truly free elections are taking place for the first time in decades. In Latin America, democracy has won impressive victories in Central and South America. Our analysis led us to believe that the confluence of events was such that it was ripe to consider whether we and other like-minded governments, should attempt to nullify "Zionism is racism."

Zionism is among the most legitimate and morally compelling of forces. In fact, to deny the legitimacy of a Jewish state, let alone to compare Zionism to racism is to turn the world upside down. Indeed, Zionism emerged as a reaction to historic anti-Semitism, one of history's most virulent racist phenomena. As the U.S. Permanent Representative to the U.N. stated on November 10, 1975, in his own speech rejecting this resolution, "the lie is that Zionism is a form of racism. The overwhelmingly clear truth is that it is not." Fifteen years later this remains the view of the U.S. Government.

Moreover, this fall will mark the 15th anniversary of the passage of Resolution 3379 (November 10, 1975) and the 45th anniversary of the United Nations itself. Surely, with one-third of the U.N.'s entire history impaired by the resolution's assault on its moral integrity, now is the time to reassess the situation.

I want to stress to the committee that we have been in close consultations with the Israeli Government on this issue, and we will remain so. The position of the Government of Israel on this very question was recently addressed at the highest levels of the foreign ministry, and it is as follows: Israel stands unreservedly for the repeal of the "Zionism is racism" resolution. At the same time, the Government of Israel wants to be certain that any effort to reverse the resolution should succeed comfortably. A "moral victory" of almost nullifying the resolution would not be a satisfactory solution to Israel, even if the number of votes in support of its position was substantially higher than in 1975.

With this in mind, Mr. Chairman, we have begun to explore diplomatically the possible strategies and tactics for repeal of the resolution.

——First, we are consulting with the thirty-five countries that joined the United States in opposing the resolution in 1975, to reiterate our belief that the resolution should be rescinded, urging their support for repeal and soliciting their views regarding coordination on appropriate strategy and timing. To date, although we have not finished our consultations, we have detected no shifts away from the positions taken in 1975.

——Second, we are consulting with numerous countries which originally voted for the resolution, but which have subsequently acquired new governments and new thinking. Once again, our consultations are far from over, but we have seen substantial evidence of shifts of opinion. Let me quote what some of the leaders of nations that voted the wrong way in 1975 have said on the subject.

On October 13, 1988, the Mexico City News reported that President-elect Carlos Salinas de Gortari had stated to World Zionist Organization President Dinitz that he was against the 1975 U.N. resolution and "will help have it removed."

On November 9, 1989, the Representative of Hungary, speaking after Israel and the United States had addressed the subject of repeal in the Third Committee of the U.N. General Assembly, said that we should "take a long, hard look on our earlier performance and decisions which might be rectified," and in this regard welcomed previous calls for "reviewing earlier United Nations resolutions."

On February 22, 1990, President Vaclav Havel of Czechoslovakia, in response to questions from U.N. correspondents whether his country would support repeal of the resolution equating Zionism with racism, stated: "We are in a position to decide for ourselves, and we will do so." When asked again later that day, he said "I didn't approve of it then; I don't approve of it now."

Most recently, on March 25, Polish Prime Minister Tadeusz Mazowiecki told a dinner of the American Jewish Congress that he condemned the U.N. resolution as "an attempt to foster hatred of Jews."

——Third, we are consulting with countries which either abstained or were absent in 1975, or which joined the United Nations after that date, some 29 in number.

——Finally, we are consulting with Arab governments, making the same points which Vice President Quayle and Secretary Baker have effectively made: reversal would help facilitate the peace process by sending a clear signal to Israel that the Arab side is ready for reconciliation, and thereby reassure Israel about Arab intentions.

As I have noted, we still have much to do in our consultations, and this is only the first round. At this early date, therefore, predictions would be uncertain at best. I can say, however, that we see distinct signs of movement, by several governments which originally voted in favor of Resolution 3379 to positions either opposing the concept that Zionism is racism or at least likely abstaining in a vote. Among the countries which abstained, did not vote, or were not members of the U.N. in 1975, we have seen similar movement toward opposing the concept that underlies Resolution 3379. Moreover, within this category, we have seen no retrograde movement toward supporting the resolution. Finally, as noted above, the 35 nations which courageously opposed Resolution 3379 in 1975 appear to be remaining steadfast.

Having said all that, Mr. Chairman, I need hardly tell a committee of the Congress that any "legislative" proposal is easier to draft than it is to steer to final passage. The General Assembly's rules of procedure are arcane, and frought with tactical opportunities for opponents of rescinding the resolution. We obviously do not want to find ourselves in a position where we have been outmaneuvered either substantively or parliamentarily.

I can assure the committee that we have given, and will continue to give, careful consideration to the strategy and tactics that will, at the appropriate moment, ensure the repeal of this odius resolution. For obvious reasons, I would prefer not to make our game plans public, but I would be more than happy to keep the committee closely informed as the fall approaches. On that score, and others, Mr. Chairman, we welcome your advice and counsel, and that of the members of the committee.

## THE ROLE OF THE SOVIET UNION

This analysis brings me to the potentially pivotal role of the Soviet Union in any repeal effort. In 1975, the Soviet Union confidently led the General Assembly charge in adopting Resolution 3379. Today, things are different, and Soviet behavior in the U.N. has begun to change as well. Throughout the specialized agencies and in the General Assembly, the Soviet Union worked quietly to help thwart the PLO's membership campaign. In the General Assembly, instead of voting to challenge Israeli credentials, the Soviets abstained for the first time. Eastern European governments are once again directing their own foreign policies.

Perhaps even more significantly, last year we negotiated the first-in-history joint United States-U.S.S.R. General Assembly resolution. It was announced at an equally unprecedented joint news conference with my Soviet opposite number and myself endorsing the underlying principles of the U.N. Charter. The fact that we had reached agreement with the Soviets relatively quickly on the resolution was remarkable. We, of course, want to see our new cooperation with the Soviets go forward, and do not want to see the Soviets take steps, such as in Lithuania, that could affect our ability to do so.

We hoped that this Soviet cooperation throughout the U.N. system could be expanded to obtain repeal of Resolution 3379. Several discussions that we have held with the Soviets at the U.N. in Moscow and here in Washington, on the issue of "Zionism is racism," unfortunately have failed to produce agreement for a concerted approach toward repealing the resolution.

Nonetheless, our dialog with the Soviet Union continues, and they have had questions that encourage us to pursue this matter further. The Soviets have assured us that the resolution represents a concept that is no longer acceptable according to the new political thinking in the Soviet Union.

CONCLUSION

To conclude, Mr. Chairman, I have welcomed this opportunity to review the administration's policy and approach toward repealing United Nations General Assembly Resolution 3379. We continue to oppose the resolution vigorously and all that it stands for. We are consulting with Israel and other countries which share our desire to see the resolution repealed. We believe that there is strong opposition to the resolution by a large and growing number of U.N. member countries. With this in mind, we are taking action and will intensify our efforts during the 1990 session of the General Assembly.

We must be most careful, nonetheless, to ensure that our efforts are not subverted by those hostile to Israel and to the Middle East peace process. Moreover, in view of the growing cooperation at the U.N. and increased ability of the organization to play a central role in resolving regional conflicts, we hope that our Soviet counterparts will see their way clear to join with us in our efforts.

Every year, a large majority in the General Assembly adopts a resolution that proposes an unacceptable, one-sided formula for Middle East peace, including a central role for the U.N. in the process. It is ironic that those who wish to see the United Nations play a central role in bringing peace to the Middle East have themselves done the most to undermine the organization's moral authority to do so through adoption of Resolution 3379, and have resisted efforts to take corrective action. Repealing the resolution is one way they could exercise their responsibility toward the U.N., take a major step to help restore its moral integrity, and thus contribute toward peace. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Senator MOYNIHAN. Thank you, Mr. Secretary.

The first thing is, just for what it is worth, when you said that Ambassador Pickering had to be in New York today, I had Mr. Rickard call his office and say that we were sorry he could not be with us. His New York office informed us that he is in Washington.

Can you keep track of your ambassadors?

Mr. BOLTON. We certainly try to, Senator. I spoke to Ambassador Pickering at about 6 p.m. last night, and it was my impression that he would be remaining in New York.

Senator MOYNIHAN. The U.S. mission has the impression that he is now in the State Department, physically. We could get him over here. Why not find out, please. Just see if he can be reached. We would like to hear from him, of course.

I guess the bottomline of our hearing is that, yes, there is some movement. I learned of it in the first instance from President Herzog on a visit to Jerusalem in January on behalf of the Subcommittee of Near East and South Asian Affairs. I learned from him of other countries that had either adopted the Australian resolution or its equivalent or indicated that they were disposed toward some such action.

We had never heard a word, sir, from the Department of State. Not one word; as if the Congress, having enacted a law which was signed by the President, made no claim on the Department, no energy in the executive branch on this matter, no sense that this is not acceptable.

While this stands, a lot of other things are in jeopardy. Our commitment to other arrangements is tentative. We have just announced that we were going to open free trade zone negotiations with the Republic of Mexico. Fine, but let Mexico first say they will have nothing to do with this proposition, or I do not know how such an arrangement is going to get through the Finance Committee.

I state to you right here and now that I am not sure that such a measure will get through the Finance Committee. I can say to you that "It is not a difficult thing to prevent it from happening." Do they know it? Do you bring this up? How many countries in the world today receive direct aid from the United States?

Mr. BOLTON. I do not know the exact number, Senator, but I believe it is in the range of 70 or 75.

Senator MOYNIHAN. About 70 or 75?

Mr. BOLTON. I could get you the exact number for the record.

Senator MOYNIHAN. Would you do that? There is a list. I assume there is an audit and that you know who they are.

Of that number, how many voted in favor of the Zionism resolution, that filthy obscenity?

Mr. BOLTON. I believe that of those 72 that voted in favor of Resolution 3379, a clear majority of them did at that point and probably still do today receive U.S. foreign assistance.

Senator MOYNIHAN. Right. We give them money even though they, have associated themselves with this vile event, which is more than just an obscenity, it is a source of fundamental instability in the region. It is one of the reasons our policies to bring about a peaceful settlement there do not succeed.

Have we ever told one country, even one country, "You are getting American money and you are not getting it anymore until you change your mind on Resolution 3379? You do not have to change your mind, but we sure do not have to give you money."

Mr. BOLTON. I do not know that any country has ever been told that, Senator.

I guess if I would leave one message with the committee here today, it is that the Bush administration is most serious about having this resolution repealed.

As I mentioned, we have already begun consultations with some 80 governments as our first round to begin testing the waters, and we expect substantial additional consultations down the road in an effort to demonstrate that there is movement.

Senator MOYNIHAN. Fine. We are not trying to be in any sense accusatory here. We want to see this effort succeed. But as a matter of record, we had never heard from you—not you personally, Mr. Secretary. You have only been on the job a year. Since we passed that law, we have never heard a word from the State Department.

Can you give us a list of those countries which receive direct American aid which voted in favor of this resolution?

Mr. BOLTON. We can certainly put such a list together for you, yes, Senator.

Senator MOYNIHAN. Certainly, and get it up to us. We want to put that in the record. We will keep the record open for it. You can have it here by the afternoon, I am sure.

Mr. BOLTON. We can certainly try.

[The information referred to follows:]

*Near East/South Asia*—Afghanistan (Afghan Humanitarian); Algeria (IMET only); Bangladesh; Egypt; India; Jordan; Lebanon; Maldives (IMET only); Morocco; Oman; Pakistan; Sri Lanka; Tunisia; N. Yemen.

*Europe*—Cyprus; Hungary; Malta (IMET only); Portugal; Turkey; Yugosalvia (IMET only).

*Latin America*—Brazil; Guyana; Mexico.

*Africa*—Burundi; Cameroon; Congo; Equatorial Guinea; Gambia; Guinea; Guinea Bisseau; Madagascar; Mali; Mauritania; Mozambique; Niger; Nigeria; Rwanda; Sao Tome; Senegal; Somalia; Tanzania; Uganda.

*East Asia and Pacific*—Indonesia; Malayeia (IMET only).

Senator MOYNIHAN. If there are technicalities, you can tell us there are some technicalities, but I am sure you can go back and get that list by the end of the day. We have a list of who the aid recipients are and how the vote went.

Do they understand that their aid is in jeopardy? I mean, enough is enough. The Soviet Union has changed. The Soviet Union no longer rewards that behavior. Have they learned it? Do they know that this country is angry about the resolution? Supports of the resolution have put peace in jeopardy in a place they have no business bothering with?

What does it mean to Chile? What does it mean to Sri Lanka? Whose business is it in the Ivory Coast to cause instability in the Middle East? By what right, by what sense of their own interests or the interests of the United Nations have done this?

I see our distinguished colleague, Mr. Pressler, is here. We welcome you, sir. I know that you have been in another committee hearing.

Would you like to make an opening statement?

Senator PRESSLER. Mr. Chairman, I may have some questions from the minority here, but at this point I thank you very much.

Senator MOYNIHAN. You are very welcome, and we are very happy to have you here.

Mr. Bolton, Mr. Secretary, this is the message we would like you to take back with you. We have one of those mornings where we have Senators obligated to be in other places. We are all supposed to be in three places at once, but I am speaking now for the entire committee. The committee asked for you to attend this hearing. I am chairman of the Subcommittee on the Near East and South Asia.

We do not like that United Nations resolution one damn bit. We see it as a residuum of a Stalinist totalitarian Soviet Union which held a large portion of the world in sway. The nonaligned nations bet on that totalitarian Russia, and they lost.

Do they know that? Have we made it clear to them that the Cold War is over and they lost and they have a lot of making up to do? They bet on Stalin and they bet on Brezhnev, and they bet wrong. When they voted as they did, they voted slavishly in adherence to the editorial propositions of Pravda.

The Soviets have said so under Shevardnadze. Do they know that we do not like it?

Mr. BOLTON. We are making it abundantly clear, Mr. Chairman, in our consultations in capitals. We have spoken with Ambassadors here in Washington. We are consulting in New York, and, as I say,

as we move closer toward the opening of the 45th General Assembly we will be making an even broader circle of consultation, looking to see if the votes are not there to rescind that resolution.

Senator MOYNIHAN. May I say, we are not pressing for action on the floor. We do not want to have a vote. We are not going to win. You know when you have the votes. I sure would like to know, and this committee would like to have a list of nations which we have asked to change their positions on this and who have failed to do so and still collect aid from the U.S. Government.

Would you take under consideration the possibility of a statute that prohibits such aid?

Mr. BOLTON. I can say——

Senator MOYNIHAN. I just asked would you take it under advisement?

Mr. BOLTON. I would be happy to take it under advisement. I can say that in our consultations, many of the governments have tentatively responded. Those which were not in the United Nations in 1975 were those which——

Senator MOYNIHAN. Of which there are how many? 15 or 20?

Mr. BOLTON. Close to 20, yes; but a number of governments have simply never reconsidered the question having considered it essentially concluded.

One of the things that we need to be doing as we consult in capitals is to make it clear that the issue is still a live one. We have been doing that, and we intend to continue doing so.

Senator MOYNIHAN. In that case, one last question. In that visit which I mentioned to Jerusalem, I called on our consul general in Jerusalem, and I received from him something of a lecture about a bill which we introduced a while back about moving the U.S. Embassy in Israel to the capital of Israel, which is Jerusalem, a fact which 83 Members of the U.S. Senate confirmed in a resolution which I introduced with Mr. Boschwitz 2 weeks ago, which was adopted unanimously in the Senate.

I got something of a lecture from the consul general on how imprudent it had been to introduce the resolution on moving the embassy. We got a majority of the Senate to sign on, and, the point having been made, we did nothing further. We just made our statement.

I asked him if he realized why we did that, and he said "No." I said, "Because in 1983 the nonaligned nations in their final declaration at the New Delhi Summit changed their draft declaration language which said that Jerusalem is occupied Palestinian territory to say that West Jerusalem is occupied Palestinian territory. That is a way of stating that the state of Israel has no right to exist." He did not know that.

Is it conceivable that our representative, our consul general, would not know why a majority of the U.S. Senate did something that important?

Mr. BOLTON. I regret that he did not know the answer to that, Senator. It was a subject of discussion here at the time. I do not know where the individual is assigned at this point.

Senator MOYNIHAN. Could you perhaps put that resolution in a frame and just hang it up in the man's office?

Mr. BOLTON. We will certainly convey to him what the reason was. I know you were instrumental in that resolution.

Senator MOYNIHAN. I was not instrumental. I introduced it and made the decision not to press it to a vote.

But we simply should say to the nonaligned, "That was not funny." Do we have any idea who did that? I was in New Delhi. We had a copy of the draft declaration. That summit was to meet in Iraq, but there was a war between Iraq and Iran, two nonaligned nations, so it was moved to Delhi. Not many changes were made in the Indian resolution, but one change was made. Do we know who did it?

Mr. BOLTON. I checked the records at the State Department, Senator, and the best I can tell you from what is available to us is that a large number of amendments were introduced to the Indian draft by Syria and the PLO. Whether the specific change with respect to West Jerusalem was introduced by the two of them, I do not know.

I know they were leading the Arab caucus to make a number of modifications in what was generally regarded as a fairly mild Indian text.

Senator MOYNIHAN. I think it was a fairly mild Indian text. This latter point was just boilerplate. It had been done before.

It would make this committee a lot happier if there were a little fire in the belly of the Department to find out who the hell did that and who went along with it and then to say to them, "There are consequences in your relations with us for going along with something like that. You are putting peace in jeopardy in a part of the world where, if you cannot be in favor of peace, you should just keep the hell out of these matters."

Senator Pressler, you have some questions, sir?

Senator PRESSLER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for this chance to interrupt here. I have two questions on behalf of Senator Helms.

First of all, it is not Mr. Pickering; is it? It is Mr. Bolton, but Mr. Helms' question is addressed to Mr. Pickering.

Senator MOYNIHAN. Well, Mr. Bolton will convey our best regards, then, and we will get an answer from Mr. Pickering if we may; is that right?

Mr. BOLTON. Yes.

Senator PRESSLER. His question is a very plain one. When will the United States move for a repeal in the U.N. of General Assembly Resolution 3379?

Mr. BOLTON. I can answer for my part. That is, we have been in preparation to look at doing something in this General Assembly opening this fall.

As I mentioned in my opening remarks, we have been in close consultation with the Government of Israel on the question. Their view is that we not make an effort unless we have a clear indication that an effort to repeal would succeed comfortably. So, I think we would want to take that view and the view of other allies into account.

We are moving to lay the groundwork if it turns out that the votes look right to try to do it this fall.

Senator PRESSLER. There are several questions that I wish to ask for the record, but in many of these questions the activities of our chairman today are documented. We have already mentioned that

Senator Moynihan was the U.S. Representative to the U.N. at the time of the resolution's adoption, and he has indicated his view that the Zionism resolution was enacted as a fallback actually from the unsuccessful Soviet-led effort to expel Israel from the U.N.

Are there any indications that the Soviet Union is now prepared to moderate its position and, specifically, how do you interpret the Soviet Union's abstention from the latest efforts to expel Israel from the U.N.?

Mr. BOLTON. The Soviet abstention on the Israel credentials question was one example of the enhanced cooperation we have had with the Soviet Union throughout the U.N. system this year.

One of the other things they did was to work quietly behind the scenes to oppose the PLO's membership application and a number of the specialized agencies. In fact, it was on the basis of those two actions and some others that led us to conclude that it would be worthwhile approaching the Soviets to ask if they might not engage in further cooperation with us by seeking to repeal Resolution 3379.

Senator PRESSLER. So, we have asked for the repeal.

Now specifically, what steps is the administration now taking to pressure the Soviet Union into changing its position?

Mr. BOLTON. We have had, I believe, four separate consultations at my level or at my principal deputy's level. We are engaged in further discussions with them. One of the things that we hope to do is to encourage those governments which have shifted their views to oppose the concept that Zionism is a form of racism to make public statements to that effect so that the visible shift in opinion which we are detecting in our diplomatic channels would be made public to evidence to the Soviets and everyone else who supported the resolution that the majority is rapidly slipping away.

We would hope that if that were to occur, many other nations would also see that the lifetime of the resolution is dwindling and would come over and support a repeal effort.

Senator PRESSLER. Now Resolution 205 which was enacted by the Senate, again sponsored by Senator Moynihan, was based on a resolution passed by the Australian Legislature. It called upon the United States to lend support to efforts to overturn Resolution 3379.

Now what other nations have passed laws repudiating the Zionism is racism resolution? Specifically, what positions have the new governments in Poland, Czechoslovakia and, indeed, East Germany taken?

Mr. BOLTON. Well, Senator Moynihan mentioned a few minutes ago, I believe, that there are six nations whose parliaments have adopted similar resolutions, Uruguay, Peru, and several others.

The Polish Prime Minister earlier this week——

Senator MOYNIHAN. Belgium, Netherlands, and the European Parliament.

Mr. BOLTON. The Polish Prime Minister earlier this week criticized the Zionism is racism resolution. There have been statements by Vaclav Havel of Czechoslovakia and statements, some less directly public, in East Germany as well that lead us to be encouraged.

Senator PRESSLER. Maybe you have already covered this. To your knowledge, has any resolution been overturned or repealed in the history of the U.N. General Assembly?

Mr. BOLTON. We have found one example where one operative paragraph of a resolution was repealed. We have our lawyers reviewing the matter to see exactly what our various options are as to how to go about it.

It is certainly not a common practice in the United Nations, but we are looking for whatever available precedents there are to make sure that we have the largest possible number of tactical options to pursue.

Senator PRESSLER. Do you foresee any U.N. action to halt or interfere with its law of emigration from the Soviet Union to Israel?

Mr. BOLTON. Well, the Security Council this week has been debating that question. We have made it abundantly clear that any resolution which purported to limit the ability of Soviet Jews to emigrate to Israel would be vetoed by us.

Senator PRESSLER. Mr. Bolton, I served as a representative from the Senate to the U.N. one fall, and it has always intrigued me that Israel was one of the only countries in the world that would vote with us on a regular basis.

How do you attribute the large-scale anti-Israel feelings within the United Nations?

Mr. BOLTON. I think a substantial amount of the sentiment is directed at delegitimatizing the state of Israel, whereas I mentioned in my prepared remarks attempting to confer the status of statehood on the PLO. The Zionism is racism resolution and a number of other actions both in the General Assembly and in other components of the United Nations system demonstrate why it is difficult for many Israelis to believe that the U.N. can have any useful role at any point in the Middle East peace process.

It is unfortunate, and we think one of the reasons, one of the principal reasons to repeal Resolution 3379 is to indicate that the supporters of the PLO in the U.N. system have begun to renounce their activity of using the U.N. system to delegitimatize Israel. We think it would be a positive contribution to the peace process.

Senator PRESSLER. OK. One final question. Why has Uruguay gotten involved? Do they have a long record of being involved in efforts such as this?

I know they are working, as I understand it, in the Latin community to gather support for a rescission of Resolution 3379. Is that a tradition with Uruguay?

Mr. BOLTON. Frankly, I do not think so. Part of the movement in Uruguay is because of a new administration, but I would be happy to research that question further and get back to you. They have certainly made public statements supporting a repeal of 3379.

Senator PRESSLER. All right, good.

[The information referred to follows:]

Uruguay voted against the Zionism in racism resolution in 1975. In our recent consultations, the Government of Uruguay indicated to the USG that Uruguay would vote to repeal the resolution, but apparently is reluctant to assume a leading role in convincing other Latin American states to support a repeal effort.

Senator PRESSLER. Did Vice President Quayle's recent speech at Yeshiva University indicate the initiation of a stronger effort to achieve a repeal of the Zionism resolution?

Mr. BOLTON. Yes, indeed, Senator. That is why we have begun consultations already with approximately 80 countries sort of as a first round; and given the results as they come in, we intend to go further.

Senator PRESSLER. Good.

I see that the author of this resolution, Senator Boschwitz, has arrived. So I have two authors on my right, the author of the original U.N. resolution and the author of the current resolution of which I am a cosponsor.

I have some additional questions for the record. I will submit Senator Helms' questions for the record.

I thank you very much.

[The information referred to follows:]

PLO EFFORT TO ENHANCE STATUS IN UN SYSTEM

*Question.* Mr. Chairman, Secretary Bolton has taken a great interest in preventing the terrorist PLO from joining the U.N. or other affiliated bodies.

1. Mr. Secretary, what positive effects have your efforts—and those of Congress—had to prevent PLO membership or upgrading to the status of a state had?

2. Some critics of our joint position Mr. Bolton, argue that it is hypocritical for the United States to block the PLO at the U.N. while chatting with its leadership in Tunis. What is your position on this?

Answer. The USG has strongly opposed the PLO's effort, on behalf of the self-declared "state of Palestine," to obtain the status of member "state" or to enhance its status in the U.N. system, including in a number of specialized agencies. This effort was in plain violation of the provisions of the constitutions of various U.N. specialized agencies. The PLO fails to satisfy the generally accepted criteria for "statehood" under international law. It is, therefore, not eligible to join as a member "state" any of the international organizations to which it applied.

The issue of PLO membership arose first at the World Health Assembly in May 1989. At that time, we also heard reports that the PLO was considering membership applications to other international organizations.

To underscore the depth of U.S. concern over this issue, Secretary Baker indicated that withholding of U.S. funds would be an inevitable response to action by a U.N. agency to admit "Palestine" as a member. Legislation that would mandate a cutoff of U.S. funding under such circumstances has since been passed by Congress. We have also made it clear that enhancement of the PLO's current observer status in the UNGA could have the same effect.

Secretary Baker's firm and unequivocal statement, and the support in Congress for that view made the difference in the World Health Organization (WHO), and later in UNESCO, enabling us to gain a deferral of the PLO's membership application. We are prepared to face a similar challenge this year and will oppose such an effort just as strongly. The new legislation will be particularly helpful in this regard.

The PLO also filed a membership application to the World Tourism Organization (an institution not part of the U.N. system). The PLO's efforts were narrowly defeated by a joint deferral resolution that I offered on behalf of the United States, Australia, and Hungary.

During last fall's U.N. General Assembly, the PLO sought to enhance its status as an observer to that of an "observer state" (like Switzerland or the Koreas). This attempt was rejected. However, at the General Assembly, the PLO attempted to have its chair on the assembly floor moved next to those used by the existing observer states. The PLO hoped to argue that its "statehood" had been at least tacitly recognized by the General Assembly. That effort failed; I am pleased to report that when the 45th General Assembly convenes this fall the PLO's seat will remain with the nonstate observers.

At the same time the United States, through Ambassador Pelletreau in Tunis, has continued the dialog with the PLO. It was and remains in our interest to hold the PLO to the commitments it undertook in December 1988. We do not view the dialog

with the PLO as an end in itself. Rather, it is a means to move the PLO to give practical application to the commitments it undertook in December, 1988, including its renunciation of terrorism. We have used our dialog to see if the PLO was willing to go along with a realistic approach to peace. Our commitment to opposing enhanced status for the self-declared "state of Palestine" in the U.N. system remains firm, nonetheless.

Senator MOYNIHAN. Thank you, Senator.

Indeed, we have Senator Boschwitz who tore himself away from yet another committee to be here.

Good morning, and welcome. You are just in time to speak to Mr. Bolton, whose testimony is very encouraging.

Senator BOSCHWITZ. Mr. Chairman, I will have to read Mr. Bolton's testimony, and then in the event that I may so wish, I will submit some questions to the record.

I would like to make my opening statement, albeit it somewhat late. I know you have told me you put the written statement in the record.

Senator MOYNIHAN. Well, if it was good the first time it will be better the second time.

Senator BOSCHWITZ. Was it read, Mr. Chairman?

Senator MOYNIHAN. No.

Senator BOSCHWITZ. I want to begin by commending you, Senator Moynihan, for holding this hearing. I believe we are serving an important purpose in making known the continued repugnance with which Congress views General Assembly Resolution 3379.

That resolution, by falsely and maliciously stating that Zionism is a form of racism and racial discrimination, has deeply stained the General Assembly's reputation for almost 15 years. By agreeing to this outright lie the General Assembly generated more resentment and anger against itself than by any other action taken since its inception 45 years ago.

The high hopes of that year, as I remember as a teenager, in the immediate aftermath of World War II pictured the U.N. as a forum for peace, for conciliation, and for compromise, and in some respects those hopes have been realized; but on November 10, 1975, when this resolution was adopted, those hopes, at least as they concerned Israel and many thinking people throughout the world, were finally dashed.

What a "fitting" date that was for the General Assembly's action. Exactly 37 years earlier to that day in 1938 another attack against Jews occurred. That one was known in history as Kristallnacht. It resulted in the destruction of synagogs throughout Germany and deaths of scores of Jewish victims. By its 1975 attack on the very foundation of the Jewish faith which was born out of Germany's attempt to murder all of Europe's Jews, the General Assembly reawakened the memories of that night.

On January 31, I introduced Senate Joint Resolution 246 along with Senators Moynihan, D'Amato, Mitchell, Dole, Pell, Helms, Metzenbaum, and Wilson. We have since been joined by 44 other Senators. This joint resolution is the third piece of legislation dealing with the General Assembly's anti-Zionism resolution since 1985.

Our Senate resolution calls upon all member states of the U.N. to take immediate action to repeal the General Assembly Resolu-

tion 3379. I am very pleased that the Vice President has recently spoken strongly in favor of that goal, more strongly, as Senator Pressler has stated, than our Government has in the past. I commend him for doing so. I certainly hope that the State Department acts vigorously in response both to the joint resolution and the remarks of the Vice President.

The General Assembly's 1975 effort to delegitimatize Israel is echoed today by those wanting to stop the significantly slow Soviet Jewish emigration to Israel. A recent report by the American Jewish Committee notes that if Israel's purpose is to serve as a home and haven for the world's Jews, then seeking to deny Jews the right to go there means negating its legitimacy. Thus, the goals of Israel's enemies remain the same now as then, to make Israel an outcast.

It is time for the General Assembly to right its 1975 wrong. The U.N.'s 45th anniversary later this year will take on a deeper meaning if this resolution is finally erased from the General Assembly's books. Until then, there can be no role for the General Assembly in the search for Middle East peace. To provide it with one before the resolution is repealed would mock the purpose for which the U.N. was created.

I would say to you, Mr. Chairman, that your role in this has been extraordinarily significant, that you have been a leader for many years, longer than I, in seeking to overturn this resolution. I commend you for it, and I commend you for this hearing. Perhaps it will be a step forward in achieving the goal.

Senator MOYNIHAN. I thank you, sir. And I thank you for bringing this up. I asked the Secretary if he would give this committee a list of those nations which voted in support of the Soviet Union in 1975, which are currently recipients of American aid.

I think they need to know that we know. And we are not content with this situation.

Could I ask just finally, would you make it a point of saying that this is not just our view. In the first instance we adopted an Australian resolution.

The committee notes that Mr. William Korey, who is the director of international policy research for the B'nai B'rith and a very distinguished scholar in these fields, is with us this morning. He recorded in an article in the Christian Science Monitor—which I would like to place in the record at this point.

[The information referred to follows:]

[Christian Science Monitor, Jan. 16, 1990]

THE U.N.'S DECREE ON ZIONISM

THE TIME COULD BE RIPE TO WIPE OUT THE 1975 'RACISM' SLUR, BUT MOSCOW HOLDS THE KEY

(By William Korey)

Nothing has damaged the moral image of the United Nations in its nearly 45-year history as much as the resolution adopted Nov. 10, 1975, stating that Zionism equals racism.

With Zionism widely perceived as a code word for Jews, the resolution invited bigots everywhere to give expression to overt Jew-baiting and then sanction it by the General Assembly's action.

The U.N. resolution, which challenged the legitimacy of Israel, is the more provocative by reason of the fact that "racism" has been formally determined by the world body to be not only evil, but illegal as well. Contracting parties to a key U.N. accord, numbering over 100 governments, are required to ban racism and its manifestations. Thus, "Zionism," too, can be considered an illegal excrescence, to be excised from the body politic.

The late Andrei D. Sakharov quite rightly called the General Assembly resolution an "abomination," but the international community has made little effort to reverse the resolution. But a growing number of countries, including a number in the Third World and in East Europe, now recognize that the incendiary equation violates the spirit and purpose of the U.N. Charter.

Critical to the success of any effort to reverse the resolution is the attitude of the Soviet Union. Moscow played a crucial role in pushing through the defamatory resolution. Its client states in the Third World led the lobbying. And the Soviet Union, more than any other country, used the resolution to justify a virulent anti-Semitic propaganda campaign masquerading as anti-Zionism.

That campaign ended in 1986. Mikhail Gorbachev's "new thinking" treats the primitivism of the propaganda with contempt. The party ideological journal Sovetskaia Kultura recently exposed the propaganda of the "stagnation era" as bordering on Hitlerism. Comparison was made between "Mein Kampf" and the works of a notorious anti-Zionism writer who had been earlier hailed by the Kremlin. Only the substitution of the word "Zionism" for "Jewry," as in Hitler's book, kept the Soviet writing from being total plagiarism.

Moreover, Moscow has carefully eschewed earlier anti-Israel hostility. A deepening diplomatic relationship has been accompanied by widening commercial and cultural exchange. At the U.N., the vulgarity of Soviet broadsides in a previous epoch has been replaced by, for example, a vote of abstention on the perennial question of Israel's credentials.

Still, anti-Zionism appears to remain a component of Soviet ideology. Recently, after a Jewish group in Moscow announced the formation of a "Zionist Union," Pravda responded with a blistering verbal assault which included the charge that "Zionism" is "racism." As legitimization for this incendiary blast, the Communist Party organ referred to the infamous U.N. equation.

For Pamyat and other populist anti-Semitic elements in the U.S.S.R., Prvada's comments on Zionism could only serve as a welcome cue to continue their propaganda outrage. They, too, mask their anti-Semitic bigotry by targeting the enemy as Zionism, not Jewry. The broadening aspects of this populist anti-Semitism helped spark today's great Jewish exodus.

Gorbachev's new posture toward the U.N. carries positive elements, including a verbal emphasis upon human rights and the rule of law. The "Zionism equals racism" formula stands in sharp contradiction to these fundamentals of the U.N.'s founders.

All the more disturbing, then, is the recent Moscow rebuff of a United States proposal for a joint superpower initiative to repeal the offensive resolution. The proposal was in keeping with the unprecedented joint United States-U.S.S.R. sponsorship at the U.N. last November of a resolution aimed at maximizing cooperation on security issues.

The fact that it was accompanied by an extraordinary press conference at the U.N. suggests that a new era has dawned in the world organization.

It's clear that Washington intends to press the cooperation initiative. How will President Gorbachev respond to this continuing American initiative? Will he, in the spirit of glasnost, dump an obscene equation that provides comfort only to the bigoted? How Moscow responds can well determine whether the initial image of the U.N. itself can be restored.

Senator MOYNIHAN. Andrei Sakharov said of Resolution 3379 that it was an "abomination."

Now do they want to be on the side of Sakharov or on the side of the Stalinists. Let them choose. They are free to choose the Stalinists, the lies, the totalitarian filth. But by God, we have no obligation thereafter to pay their bills.

Just put it that way, because we need to know: choose Sakharov or choose Stalin. Just let us know. Would you get that message on the wires, Mr. Secretary? Most of our Ambassadors in those places have not a great deal to do—it is not their doing—but there is not

a great deal of business. Will they understand that this is important to the Committee on Foreign Relations?

Mr. BOLTON. I can assure you that they will understand it, Mr. Chairman.

Senator MOYNIHAN. And we thank you.

Senator BOSCHWITZ. Did you emphasize—I would ask the Senator from New York—did you emphasize to Secretary Bolton the failure to understand it in the past, and apparently the failure to have some cognizance of what the position of certainly the Congress is that these efforts on our part apparently have not been transmitted by the State Department to its officers in the appropriate countries.

Mr. BOLTON. I can promise you this, Mr. Chairman. We will send a worldwide report of this hearing——

Senator MOYNIHAN. Good.

Mr. BOLTON [continuing]. Expressing in your language what the views of the committee are.

Senator MOYNIHAN. And this is an absolutely bipartisan view, and, I can tell you, it is a unanimous view.

Mr. BOLTON. We will convey that as well.

Senator BOSCHWITZ. I would suggest the language that Senator Moynihan just used would be very appropriate. It certainly could not be stronger.

Mr. BOLTON. I believe we are taping the hearing. So, if the tape works, we will get it verbatim.

Senator MOYNIHAN. Thank you, Mr. Secretary, and our regards to Mr. Pickering. We appreciate your testimony and we look forward to responses to the questions that have been submitted and particularly to receiving that list.

Mr. BOLTON. Yes. Thank you again, Mr. Chairman, we will get to work on that as soon as we get back to the Department. Thank you.

Senator MOYNIHAN. Good.

We now have a panel of most distinguished representatives who are here to speak on behalf of the public.

They are, in the order that they are listed in our agenda: Mr. Seymour Reich, who is the chairman of the Conference of Presidents of major American-Jewish organizations. Mr. Reich, we welcome you to the committee, sir.

Mr. Kenneth Bialkin, who is president of the Jewish Community Relations Council of New York and many other things. An eminent New York attorney and person of the widest range of accomplishments and interest.

And then last, Mr. Joseph, Burton Joseph, who is former chairman of the Anti-Defamation League here in Washington just as the agenda provides.

Mr. Reich, we welcome you. Everyone's statement will be placed in the record as if read. But proceed exactly as you would like.

Mr. Reich.

Senator BOSCHWITZ. I would say, Mr. Chairman, that I would note that Mr. Joseph is listed as being from Washington, DC, unless he has moved recently. He used to be from Minnesota.

One of the great sources of pride to Minnesotans is that the chairman of the Anti-Defamation League should come from our

State. His wife was the very distinguished Ambassador to the Netherlands in the 1970's. And I believe that you know him well.

Senator MOYNIHAN. We certainly do. I think that the designation indicates that the Anti-Defamation League is located in Washington.

Senator BOSCHWITZ. Well, that is where it is.

Senator MOYNIHAN. Of course, he can resolve that matter. Do you want to answer that question directly right now?

Mr. JOSEPH. Well, I am here in place of Mr. Pickering. How is that? [Laughter.]

Senator MOYNIHAN. On that note of ambiguity, let us begin with Mr. Reich.

## STATEMENT OF SEYMOUR D. REICH, CHAIRMAN, CONFERENCE OF PRESIDENTS OF THE MAJOR AMERICAN JEWISH ORGANIZATIONS

Mr. REICH. To remove any doubt, Mr. Joseph is from Minnesota. And indeed I am privileged to be with Mr. Bialkin and Mr. Joseph at this hearing.

Mr. Chairman, my name is Seymour Reich, chairman of the Conference of Presidents of the Major American-Jewish Organizations and president of B'nai B'rith International. I am here to speak on behalf of the Conference's 46 member national organizations.

I am pleased to testify before you on one of the critical, moral, political issues confronting the international community; 15 years ago on November 10, 1975, the United Nations General Assembly perpetrated upon humanity what Andrei Sakharov justly called—as you indicated before—an abomination. Adoption of a resolution defining Zionism as a "form of racism and racial discrimination." It is ironic indeed that this resolution was adopted on the anniversary of Krystallnacht, November 10, 1938, when more than 1,400 synagogs and countless Jewish homes and stores were destroyed by the Nazis.

Nothing has tarnished the image of the United Nations in its now 45-year-old history. Nothing has subverted the peacekeeping and human rights aims of the U.N. Charter as much as this resolution.

The definition of course was a blatant falsehood, an Orwellian inversion of language. Zionism is the historic striving of the Jewish people for national fulfillment and embodies the ageold dream of the return to their historic homeland.

To call it racism in the face of the absorption and in-gathering of people of all races, whether Africans, Asians, or Occidentals by Israel is a malicious and moral obscenity.

The General Assembly resolution served two purposes: the delegitimization of Israel and the legitimization of anti-Semitism. By defining the very philosophy upon which the Jewish state was founded as "racist," it called into question Israel's very legitimacy, its birthright. The Jewish state, in essence, was formally declared to be evil and placed beyond the pale of civilized society.

Moreover, since "racism" had already been characterized in international law—the international convention on the elimination

of all forms of racial discrimination—as illegal, the very existence of the Jewish state was placed in jeopardy.

Not only were efforts sanctioned to exclude Israel from the international organization and its various specialized agencies or to diminish its status and rights—a practice diligently pursued by its enemies even until the present. But even terrorism against the Jewish state was provided a cruel justification.

Thus the U.N. resolution has had the effect of undermining initiatives toward a peaceful settlement of Middle East disputes—a major purpose of the U.N. Charter. And it made it even more difficult, meaningful efforts to cope with the scourge of terrorism in the international community.

Even worse that the consequent rationalizations of an obsessive assault upon a member state of the United Nations was the sanction given to anti-Semitism. By legitimizing a tax upon Zionism as a satanic evil in the modern world, the U.N. resolution offered bigots an appropriate device to cloak their campaign against Jewry. If Nazism with its core element—anti-Semitism—is no longer regarded as acceptable, Jewbaiters could not mask their perspective by merely dubbing it anti-Zionism.

Thus, throughout the 1970's—and into the 1980's—under the regime of Leonard Brezhnev a vast Kremlin-coordinated propaganda campaign against Jewry, masquerading as anti-Semitism saturated the Soviet public as well as other nations. Mikhail Gorbachev brought an end to the official Soviet campaign in 1986. But this horrendous drive contributed to today's populist anti-Semitism reflected it the activities of Pamyat and other chauvinist groups, which all too often find support among neo-Stalinist and Russian national elements in the U.S.S.R.

When the Third Committee of the General Assembly was about to approve the incendiary resolution on October 17, 1975, a prominent and perceptive British critic, Goronowy Rees recorded his impression: "There were ghosts haunting the Third Committee that day; the ghosts of Hitler and Goebbels and Julius Streicher, grinning with delight to hear not only Israel but Jews as such denounced in language which would have provoked historical applause at any Nuremberg rally."

Mr. Chairman, it is time to exorcise these ghosts. The "abomination" must be ended. What Leonard Garment called the "supreme act of deceit" should be repealed; 15 years of an odious lie ought to be finally revoked. If the U.N. is to effectively assume a meaningful role in advancing peaceful settlement of disputes in the Middle East and in combating bigotry and hatred, it is obliged to remove the resolution which morally stains its image and severely damages its credibility.

Critical to the success of a revocation initiative is the attitude of the Soviet Union. Moscow paid a crucial, if not the central role, in pushing through the defamatory resolution. Its client states in the Third World were in the forefront of the lobbying effort.

Gorbachev's new posture toward the U.N. carries positive elements, including a verbal emphasis upon human rights and the rule of law. The Zionism equals racism formula stands in sharp contradiction to these fundamentals of the U.N. founders. Moscow has careful eschewed earlier anti-Israel hostility. A deepening dip-

lomatic relationship has been accompanied by widening commercial and cultural exchange.

Moreover, a key Soviet diplomat in London has commented: "If we recognize the state which brings in Jews from the four corners of the world, we must recognize the ideological movement on which it is founded."

Every President has echoed President Gerald Ford's statement at the time deploring "in the strongest terms" the U.N. vote which he said "undermines the principles upon which the United Nations is based." As then Vice President George Bush said on September 7, 1988, before the B'nai B'rith International convention: "As far as I am concerned the United Nation's General Assembly renders itself irrelevant when it passes such resolutions as Zionism is racism. It is irrelevant and wrong, wrong as it can be."

I welcome the statement made by Vice President Dan Quayle last December, when he called for the cooperation of the United States and the Soviet Union "in overturning the one General Assembly that resolution that more than any other stands in direct and glaring contradiction to the Charter's principles." And I welcome this proposed Senate Joint Resolution 246 which calls upon all member states of the United Nations General Assembly to move toward repeal of the Zionism equals racism act.

The remarkable expansion of democracy in Latin America and Eastern Europe offers considerable encouragement for the success of your initiative. A characteristic response is that of the new President of Czechoslovakia, Vaclav Havel. On February 22, commenting upon the infamous 1975 U.N. resolution, he declared: "I did not approve it then, I do not approve of it now."

It is a sentiment, Mr. Chairman, with which the enlightened world will agree.

I thank you, Mr. Chairman, and members of the committee for giving me this opportunity to share the views of the Conference of Presidents of major American-Jewish organizations.

Senator MOYNIHAN. We thank you, sir.

We will hold our questions until each member of the panel has spoken. But let me say, I particularly appreciate your reference to Leonard Garment, who was so singularly important in the struggle in the Third Committee, and also your reference to President Ford who was implacable in this regard and supported his U.N. delegation as few Presidents have done.

## STATEMENT OF KENNETH BIALKIN, PRESIDENT, JEWISH COMMUNITY RELATIONS COUNCIL OF NEW YORK

Mr. BIALKIN. Good morning, Mr. Chairman.

I appreciate very much the opportunity to appear before you and Senator Boschwitz on this important occasion. I am delighted to be with my successor, Seymour Reich as chairman of the Conference of Presidents and with my predecessor, Burt Joseph as national chairman of the Anti-Defamation League.

Senator MOYNIHAN. You see, reincarnation fell on all of you. [Laughter.]

Mr. BIALKIN. I appear this morning as president of the JCRC, the Jewish Community Relations Council of New York, which repre-

sents 64 organizations actively operating in New York City, and on their behalf, I appreciate the opportunity to be here.

I want to recall an event in New York City in which Senator Moynihan figured prominently. On the 10th anniversary of the adoption of the infamous Zionism is racism resolution on November 10, 1985, the Israel mission to the United Nations and the Conference of Presidents of major American-Jewish organizations sponsored at the United Nations a conference on Zionism, Israel and the United Nations.

I have here the proceedings of that conference, Mr. Chairman, and I would like to offer it for the record with your permission.

Senator MOYNIHAN. We will place it in the record at this point.

[The information referred to follows:]

CONFERENCE ON ISRAEL, ZIONISM, AND THE UNITED NATIONS

(Cosponsored by the Israel Mission to the United Nations and the Conference of Presidents of Major American Jewish Organizations—Nov. 10, 1985)

Ambassador NETANYAHY. Ladies and gentlemen, I'd like to welcome you all on behalf of the mission of Israel to the United Nations.

We didn't choose to convene this historic conference on Israel and Zionism and the United Nations, or the time and place—by accident. It's impossible to discuss the relationship and the experience of Israel with the United Nations without discussing the most egregious assault on Israel's legitimacy that took place here, in these halls, exactly 10 years ago. The campaign against Israel in the U.N. gathered steam in the 1950's and in the 1960's, but it culminated in that shameful day in which the resolution equating Zionism with racism was passed in the mid-1970's.

Now each year since then this slander has been elaborated and amplified and perfected in the various forums of the United Nations. It's been dispatched to every corner of the Earth, maybe not to the United States, or Israel, but I assure you—as you may hear from some of our distinguished delegates—it has taken root in five continents and regrettably, it makes a difference.

This campaign is continued today in the attempt to deny Israel its credentials as a prelude to its expulsion from the U.N. Ever since the adoption of this resolution, the effort has been to make Israel a pariah state, to expel it from the community of nations, to deny its legitimacy and to wage unremitting political warfare against it. There is no better encapsulization of this effort, than the U.N. resolution against Zionism. And that is why we choose to focus on it, to discuss it, to criticize it and also to offer some suggestions, because this is not only a matter for us it's a matter for the United Nations itself. If the U.N. is ever going to return to any semblance of legitimacy in world affairs, it will have to rid itself of this obsession. And I hope that this is the beginning of this process today.

I would like to offer thanks to the many individuals in this room who have helped the Mission of Israel to the U.N. arrange this conference, and especially to the distinguished leaders of the committee for the conference.I would like to read now two messages. The first is from the President of Israel:

"My friends, my thoughts go back to this historic debate in the U.N. on the infamous resolution on Zionism passed by the General Assembly. The issue before the Assembly was neither Israel nor Zionism. It was the continued existence of the U.N., which had been dragged to its lowest point of discredit by a coalition of despots and racists. As we look back on that eventful struggle in the U.N., its significance increases in importance against the perspective of time. Totalitarian forces allied with international terrorists pursue their policy against the forces of freedom and human decency. A great evil was done to the Jewish people at the time, but as in the past so now too: The oppressors of our people pass into oblivion while we the Jewish people, which has survived them all, will survive the shameful exhibition in the U.N.

"From the very outset of the struggle on October 3 in the Third Committee, the U.S. and the forces of freedom and democracy in the U.N. stood by our side. From the moment that the U.S. representative in the Third Committee, Leonard Garment, cried out, 'This is an infamous act,' until the dramatic hours on November 10, the U.S. delegation stood firmly by Israel's side. And leading the struggle was my good friend Pat Moynihan, a great ambassador, who represented before the nations

of the world the principles of freedom and decency which are the cornerstone of the American philosophy and way of life.

"Many tried and true friends were at our side. We shall never forget them and their moving support of Zionism, the national liberation movement of the Jewish people. Above all I recall the impassioned plea of Father Benjamin Nunez of Costa Rica. The memory of the events in the U.N. of 10 years ago and of the struggle between the forces of freedom and the forces of bigotry, hate, and falsehood inspire us all in our efforts to stem the tide of evil and advance the cause of man.

"Signed, Chaim Herzog."

I have a second message from the President of the United States:

"Few events have so offended the American people as the 'Zionism-is-racism' resolution of November 10, 1975. It was as if all America stood to affirm the response of our chief delegate, Daniel Patrick Moynihan. 'The United States,' he said, 'rises to declare before the General Assembly of the United Nations and before the world that it does not acknowledge, it will never abide by, it will never acquiesce in this infamous act.'

"The United States, under the leadership of three different Presidents, has remained true to that pledge. Today I am proud to reaffirm that promise and further to pledge my support for the removal of this blot from the United Nations record.

"Signed, Ronald Reagan."

I would like to begin by talking very briefly about one of the outstanding people with us today. You have just heard two Presidents mention the extraordinary battle that he did as a gladiator in this arena in 1975. But as you have seen, at least one of them, Chaim Herzog, moved on to bigger and better things. Well, our first speaker has also moved on—if I may say so, with Ambassador Walters' consent—to bigger and better things, but his words, his thrilling words, still echo powerfully in this chamber.

Ladies and gentlemen, it is my pleasure to introduce the senior Senator from the State of New York, Daniel Patrick Moynihan.

Senator MOYNIHAN. Thank you. Mr. Chairman and excellencies, ambassadors, and, along with President Herzog, I'd like to welcome our old comrade in arms, Ambassador Nunez. It was a very lonely night 10 years ago, and he was there and his nation was there, and we will not forget it.

I'm going to speak in fairly concise terms of what seems to me to be a kind of agenda we need to work out in the terms that President Reagan spoke of: What are we going to do about this and in what sense do we think of undoing it? A certain perspective is needed on the event which is easily lost. Let me see if I can't get it through to you in these terms.

If I say to you that of the three major countries involved in the events that led up to the resolution on Zionism—Israel, the United States, and the Soviet Union—hear me when I say to you that there was more public protest in the Soviet Union than there was in the United States or Israel. Now think about that. On October 26 Jews in 15 Soviet cities gathered and issued statements pleading with the world not to do this. At about the same time on—that was October 26—from Moscow Andrei Sakharov, declared that if this resolution were adopted it could only contribute to anti-Semitic tendencies in many countries by giving them the appearance of international legitimacy. Now we just have to acknowledge that there was very little attention paid here and very little attention paid in Israel. Now, why was the reaction in the Soviet Union so strong?

Well, the simple fact is that the proposition that Zionism is a form of racism and that Zionists, Jews, far from having been the victims of the Nazis, were the accomplices—that first appeared in Pravda in a two-part signed article in 1970 by a man named Bolshikov who is now the foreign editor of Pravda. A two-part article in Pravda is not just a two-part article on the op-ed page of the New York Times. It means it is the announcement of a government position that will be pressed and pursued over long periods of time. And so in the Soviet Union this was not an unfamiliar position. Very slowly it made its way to this country. I guess part of the extraordinary power of this argument is that it leads to avoidance. People don't want to hear about it.

About 4 years ago, the President's Commission on the Holocaust, which is headed by that most extraordinary man, Eli Wiesel, made its way to Babi Yar in the Ukraine. They were struck to find no notice, no memory, no recognition of any kind in any inscription that hundreds of thousands of Jews had been massacred in Babi Yar. And this was reported back in our press. And yet Bolshikov in those Pravda articles had declared that Babi Yar was a collaboration of the SS and the Zionists. Jews in the Soviet Union could hear this. Men like Sakharov could hear this. We

didn't hear it, didn't want to hear it, and even after we had been told, didn't want to remember it. The Soviet connection here is important and has not been explored.

When the issue was first presented, it had almost no reaction in this country. The reaction was more or less confined to the U.S. and Israeli U.N. Missions—and not, I think, to our respective governments, which were not that interested in what goes on in the General Assembly anyway. Our first statement, as President Herzog has said, came on October 17 when Leonard Garment told the Third Committee, "I choose my words carefully when I say this is an obscene act." I wish that Leonard Garment and Suzanne Garment, who were both members of the Mission staff, were here today, because I think they would speak in much these same terms. "An obscene act," we called it. We knew what we were saying. We knew what the reaction would be. The Israeli delegation spoke no less forcefully on that and similar occasions to the Third Committee. But it was too late. The votes had been counted, votes that had been together well before, and within 3 weeks the deed was done.

I do think there was a momentary shock of "Oh my God! What did we do?" There was some measure of that. I took the measure a few weeks later one evening when the Iranian ambassador was giving a dinner for the Lebanese ambassador. My wife was sitting next to the French ambassador, a very distinguished and elegant man. The subject of the vote on Zionism came up—Liz raised it, I guess—and he said, "Well, my dear lady, you know we would not have lost the vote if your husband had not given such a confrontational speech." Well, there is a detail you need to know, which is that I gave my speech after the vote. It's called a speech in explanation of the vote. We knew perfectly well that we would get that kind of reaction if we said what we thought before the vote. So to avoid just that we waited—but there was the Ambassador of France saying it nonetheless.

Still, it seems to me that there has been relatively little inquiring into the origins of the resolution or its consequences. I wrote a little book with Suzanne Garment a few years later, and I said, "Though it was the Soviet question which preoccupied me at the time, the question seemingly never occurred to anyone in Washington. What did it matter whose idea it was?" Well, it seemed to me that it mattered a great deal. And it continues to matter, and if we have any serious intention to ever get rid of this resolution, we're going to have to work out its origins and its place in Soviet thinking, in Arab thinking and the nonaligned coalitions. We have not done this.

There has been virtually no scholarship of any kind on this subject. I wrote a narration of the events of the General Assembly. I wrote in two other books a few little inquiries into the background. I ferreted out Bolshikov and things like that. Over at Princeton Arthur Lewis wrote a monograph for Foreign Affairs that appeared in 1978. And stopped there. Last year, when President Herzog had finally put a government together and had a moment to think about other things, he called the first conference ever to meet in Israel on this subject. And he called it in the President's residence. And he got some of those fellows down from Mount Scopus and said, "Can you spare 3 days of your time for this issue?" And we got some pretty good papers. It took 9 years after the event and the election of Chaim Herzog to the Presidency before anybody could so much as say, "Oh yeah, I wonder what they did there?"

I would offer a second thought in terms of the specific timing. And that is that the General Assembly that adopted this resolution was preceded by a special session on North-South economic relations, which is really the way I ended up here. I had been Ambassador to India, and I was going back to school. But we had had three special sessions in a row, 3 years running, each ending in absolute failure, and a real crisis in North-South economic relations seemed to have developed. OPEC had come in. The oil crisis had made things even worse. Another failure was going to mean something larger in the world, or so President Ford felt. He asked me to come here. Now something very important happened. Far from being confrontational, we got a unanimous agreement at that special session. It took a lot of bargaining, 3 days and 3 nights. The special session ended at 11:45 on September 15—11:45 in the morning. The General Assembly, the regular session, began at noon. We had about a 12-minute interval between one and the other. We had reached agreements on commodity prices, currency, oil, aid levels, industrialization, trade. And to the extent that we had succeeded, the Soviets had failed. Throughout that conference, as the "Southern" nations—demanded more assistance of the industrial nations, all the Soviets could do was to say, "We have never been colonialists and plundered the wealth of other nations." Something you might ask of the Uzbeks and Afghans and Tajiks and God knows who else—but even so, it was a charge that they make. They say, "You are owed by your former colonial masters. We owe you nothing." Which is a way of saying, "We aren't going to give you anything." And I do sense that at

this point they said, "Listen, we'd better get this alliance in better shape than it was," and they came along with the Zionism argument which locked the Arabs in, which the Africans were going along with, and suddenly they had this bloc.

That's a theory. I don't know the real makings of it. But as I say, there has been very little inquiry. There is no scholarship and neither has it penetrated into our diplomacy. President Reagan is quite right that three Presidents have been loyal on this issue. But the subject has never really made its way into our multilateral dealings. One of the reasons is that—this is another theory—the United States is not used to multilateral diplomacy. We are a very old nation, really the oldest nation. We have a tradition of bilateral diplomacy. And we've never learned this kind of diplomacy, which is the only kind most nations of the world know.

I'll give you one quick example. A group of us Senators were in Peking in late August and met with Deng Xiao Ping. Deng began by saying, "Our relations are fine. Nothing can change them. We are in exellent shape." And we went on to talk about a nuclear power agreement in which we, the United States, are going to give nuclear power technology to a totalitarian state. The state permits no inspection, and hasn't signed a nonproliferation treaty. We each had to sign documents, when it came time for me to sign the accord, I said to Deng Xiao Ping, "Now you know our relationships are very good on a bilateral basis. But when we look at the United Nations and other places it's another story. We wonder if you don't have a 'Two America' policy. During the last General Assembly you voted with the Soviet Union against the United States 89 separate times. We selected 20 what we call 'name-calling' votes, just a nasty reference to the United States and, almost invariably, Israel. And in every one of those votes you voted with the Soviet Union and against the United States. Now what does that tell us?" Senator Wilson broke in to say, "How do we explain this nuclear arrangement to our citizens, our constituents at home, when you have this record?" Well I'm not sure Deng quite understands the need to explain things to constituents, but the fact is we raised it as Senators. Our Government never raised it in the course of the negotiations. We never linked these things, one thing to another. And until we start linking cooperation in economic and military spheres and refutation of the Zionism resolution, that resolution will stay in place. But once we do start linking it, if we've got 10 years and tenacity, it can be done. Thank you.

Ambassador NETANYAHU. Thank you very much, Senator Moynihan, for a thoughtful and informative speech. It proves that Senator Moynihan is really a classic Zionist. One of the founders of modern Zionism was Israel Zangwill, the great English Jew, who said that you have to understand the origins of bad things and stop them when they are small. And he was right. And Senator Moynihan is right.

Of our next speaker it may be said in the best sense of the phrase that he speaks in many tongues, and in each of them he speaks the truth. It is my pleasure to introduce my colleague and my good friend, the Permanent Representative of the United States to the United Nations, Ambassador Vernon Walters.

Ambassador WALTERS. Yesterday marked the 68th anniversary of the Balfour Declaration, which helped realize the Zionist dream of a modern Jewish state—the State of Israel. And today we are gathered to mark the 10th anniversary of General Assembly Resolution 3379, which declared that Zionism—the national liberation movement of the Jewish people—is a form of racism.

The United States fought that disgraceful resolution at the time and has never stopped fighting it and what it represents. Some people present at this meeting were also present in the General Assembly at the time. They fought valiantly against this shameful resolution, and I salute them today for their steadfastness.

During this 40th anniversary session of the United Nations, the United States has continued to speak out forcefully against the offensive lie embodied in this resolution. President Reagan called it "the total inversion of morality," when he addressed the General Assembly on October 24.

Let me, if I may, explore the meaning of the resolution and share with you the concrete ways the U.S. Mission is fighting against this evil thing.

But before doing that, it is important to know what Zionism is and what racism is. On May 15,1948, the founders of the State of Israel proclaimed their independence. I would like to read to you some excerpts from the declaration of Israeli statehood:

"In the land of Israel the Jewish people came into being. In this Land was shaped their spiritual, religious, and national character. Here they lived in sovereign independence. Here they created a culture of national and universal import, and gave to the world the eternal book of books.

"Exiled by force, still the Jewish people kept faith with their land in all the countries of their dispersion, steadfast in their prayer and hope to return and here revive their political freedom.

"Fired by this attachment of history and tradition, the Jews in every generation strove to renew their roots in the ancient homeland, and in recent generations they came home in their multitudes.

"The State of Israel will be open to Jewish immigration and the ingathering of exiles. It will devote itself to developing the land for the good of all its inhabitants.

"It will rest upon foundations of liberty, justice, and peace as envisioned by the Prophets of Israel. It will maintain complete equality of social and political rights for all its citizens without distinction of creed, race or sex. It will guarantee freedom of religion and conscience, of language, education, and culture. It will safeguard the Holy Places of all religions. It will be loyal to the principles of the United Nations Charter.

"The State of Israel will be prepared to cooperate with the organs and representatives of the United Nations in carrying out the General Assembly Resolution of November 29, 1947, and will work for the establishment of the economic union of the whole land of Israel.

"We appeal to the United Nations to assist the Jewish people in the building of their state and to admit the State of Israel into the family of nations.

"Even amidst the violent attacks launched against us for months past, we call upon the sons of the Arab people dwelling in Israel to keep the peace and to play their part in building the state on the basis of full and equal citizenship and due representation in all its institutions, provisional and permanent.

"We extend the hand of peace and good neighborliness to all the states around us and to their people and we call upon them to cooperate in mutual helpfulness with the independent Jewish nation in its land. The State of Israel is prepared to make its contribution in a concerted effort for the advancement of the entire Middle East."

These excerpts from the declaration of statehood provide a basic introduction to the more important principles of Zionism. Now, what is racism?

Curiously enough, the term "racism" does not have a long history in the English language—it was first used in French and came to us when a book by Leon Trotsky was translated in 1936. The 1944 edition of the Concise Oxford Dictionary includes a mention of racism, and the 1974 Encyclopedia Brittanica defines racism as "the notion that some races are inherently superior to others."

The 1975 French Petit Larousse defines "racism" as "a system which affirms the superiority of one racial group above the others, presupposing the separation of this group within a country (racial segregation)," or "likewise noting the extermination of a minority (the anti-Semitic racism of the Nazis)."

How ironic that while the United Nations General Assembly resolution labels Zionism a form of racism, the dictionary definition cites the Nazi Holocaust as its example of racism.

Such outrageous misuse of words, which are after all, the weapons, or the building blocks, of the United Nations, is a tactic in common use. It is not only a vile tactic, but it is one we ignore at our peril. But we do not ignore it. This campaign to equate Zionism with racism threatens not only Israel, but all nations and people who value democracy and care about human rights, human dignity, and justice. The well-coordinated, so-called anti-Zionist campaign did not begin with the infamous resolution which we gather here to denounce, nor, more important, did it end there.

Though the resolution was a particularly ominous step, it was just part of a systematic campaign to undermine Israel's legitimacy and to foster an image of Israel as an outlaw state. This campaign poses several major dangers to all of us:

First, it paves the way for a revival of anti-Semitism, and threatens to reverse the gains made in the past 40 post-Holocaust years. Many of those who champion the resolution see it as a device by which they can impugn the loyalty of Jews living outside Israel to their own governments.

Second, it attempts to undermine the legitimacy of the State of Israel, by labelling the philosophy on which the state was founded as racist. In fact Zionism is a movement of national liberation and self-determination.

And finally, an attack on Zionism is also an attack on Western democratic values in general. Those who attack Zionism want to poison the moral atmosphere of the West. Zionism has become a new red flag which is used at a host of international meetings and assemblies, diverting attention away from genuine problems. I need hardly tell you that this is particularly useful for the Soviet Union and its allies.

Another vicious aspect of the current propaganda campaign to discredit Israel is the infamous linking of Zionism with apartheid. This began in 1973, when Zionism

was first condemned in the context of a resolution on apartheid sponsored by Burundi. In 1975 three major world conferences denounced Israel through anti-Zionist resolutions: The world conference of the International Women's Year in Mexico, the assembly of heads of state of the Organization of African Unity in Uganda, and the conference of Foreign Ministers of the non-Aligned States.

This campaign was to have culminated in the expulsion of Israel from the United Nations, but instead it resulted in passing Resolution 3379. Critics of Israel have persistently failed to note that the State of Israel vigorously and regularly condemns apartheid. In fact, Israel recently circulated its condemnation of apartheid as an official United Nations document.

In view of this, one wonders sometimes whether and why the United Nations matters. But I am sure that all of you demonstrate, by your presence here in this hall, that the U.N. does matter, and that no nation can flourish in isolation without exchanges of trade, resources, communications, ideas, technology, or culture. That is why universality is worth fighting for.

Obviously, many nations with much poorer records than Israel in social welfare, human rights, and democracy continue to take their seats each year at the U.N. General Assembly without having to endure the hypocrisy of challenges to their credentials, without having to hear abusive, false, and vicious charges about their integrity and their very right to exist.

The United States has stated its position clearly and forcefully many, many times and we will continue to make our voice heard. We believe that the resolution equating Zionism and racism is an obscenity, a falsehood, a slander of mammoth proportions. We reiterate that we will not continue to sit in a General Assembly which does not include the State of Israel.

But there is some good news to report. The General Assembly, with considerable prodding from the United States, is slowly correcting its course, so that the picture is not as gloomy as it had been.

During this very important 40th General Assembly, where so much attention has been paid to the U.N. as an institution and where some 80 heads of state and many foreign ministers have addressed the General Assembly and the Security Council, the United States is working to support our position regarding Israel and to infuse the United Nations with a new, more positive mood. Let me share with you the record of the first half of this historic 40th General Assembly.

Let's start not chronologically but rather with the 40th anniversary commemoration itself. Many of you know that there was no anniversary declaration on this occasion. How did this happen? Quite simply, there was no declaration, because the community of nations which constitute the United Nations could not agree on several issues.

The most important point for the United States, however, was the so-called question of Palestine. As I mentioned earlier, words are weapons and wording is very important here. The very posing of the "question of Palestine" implies here that the State of Israel is a nonlegitimate entity. So, obviously, the United States refused to support this language. Without the agreement of the United States, there was no declaration, because the declaration and indeed all aspects of the 40th anniversary commemoration had to be approved not by a simple majority, but by consensus.

One of the basic agreements arrived at by consensus for the 40th anniversary celebration was the decision to limit plenary appearances during the October 14–25 period to chiefs of state and heads of government. The proposal to invite Mr. Arafat violated this agreement. It also broke with the more fundamental concept of consensus decisions on all anniversary activities.

We believed strongly that nothing should be planned which would have detracted from the very purpose and meaning of this event. I think it is important to know that not only the United States, Israeli, and other Western delegations, but also many Third World nations and officials of the U.N. Secretariat itself felt strongly on this issue. All wanted to restore the image of the U.N. as an appropriate forum for conflict resolution through application of democratic values. All wanted to avoid adding such a hostile and divisive note to the commemoration. Therefore, I did not detect very many tears or much gnashing of teeth when Mr. Arafat's move to crash the U.N.'s 40th birthday party was stopped at the door.

Shortly after the Israeli attack on PLO headquarters in Tunisia, the tragic episode of the *Achille Lauro* hijacking took place. This incident of piracy, which included the brutal murder of an innocent American citizen, let to a historic first for the U.N. Security Council. On October 9, 1985, at its 2,618th meeting, I, in my capacity as President, made the following statement on behalf of all 15 members of the Security Council:

"The members of the Security Council welcome the news of the release of the passengers and the crew of the cruise ship *Achille Lauro* and deplore the reported death of a passenger.

"They endorse the Secretary-General's statement of October 8, 1985, which condemns all acts of terrorism.

"They resolutely condemn this unjustifiable and criminal hijacking as well as other acts of terrorism, including hostagetaking.

"They also condemn terrorism in all its forms, wherever and by whomever committed."

This tragic period during which a Soviet diplomat was also brutally murdered in Lebanon—led to the unusual show of unanimity in the Security Council, and I am proud that I was privileged to serve as its leader at this historic and courageous moment.

The American position on terrorism is firm. We deplore it in all its manifestations as a scourge on humanity and a menace to us all. We cannot understand why all other nations are not equally motivated to speak out and act against terrorism, but we are extremely gratified by the Security Council action.

Finally, I should mention this year's round in what has become an annual challenge to Israel's credentials to sit in the General Assembly. While last year's resolution was introduced by Iran, this year's was sponsored by Kuwait on behalf of the entire Arab group. Despite this less "extreme" sponsorship and the turbulent atmosphere following the raid in Tunisia, Israel did not lose a single vote. In fact some previously negative votes switched to abstentions. Jordan and Oman, who belong to the group, absented themselves from the vote and Egypt voted with Israel and the United States.

This positive outcome is a tribute to Israel's diplomacy. Of course, we also made our own views known clearly. We firmly oppose any measure to unseat Israel from the General Assembly, and we will use all available diplomatic resources to support our opposition. An attack on Israel's right to participate in the United Nations or any of its specialized agencies, if successful, would affect our own continued participation and support.

As Secretary of State George Shultz stated on October 16, 1982, if Israel were excluded from the General Assembly, the United States would withdraw from participation in the General Assembly and would withhold payments to the United Nations until Israel's right to participate was restored. That remains our policy, and I am proud to point to our recent achievements in support of that policy.

I would like to leave with you two more thoughts—one modern, based on ancient wisdom and one ancient, but still as germane as when it was written. I read earlier from the Israeli declaration of statehood that the new state "will rest upon foundations of liberty, justice, and peace as envisioned by the prophets of Israel." In the face of challenges to Israel's very existence, in the face of charges that this country which has welcomed new citizens from more than 100 nations around the globe speaking some 80 diverse languages is a racist entity, Israel has set forth a challenge, to serve as a beacon, to try to reach a settlement based on U.N. Resolutions 242 and 338. This was reiterated by Prime Minister Peres both here and in Israel during the past several weeks.

Israel and the United States both hope that the Camp David accords and the treaty with Egypt are but a first step on the road to an overall Mideast peace and a new era of regional development. We all recall with hope the prophet Isaiah's vision of a day when "Israel shall be the third with Egypt and with Assyria, a blessing in the midst of the Earth."

But the path to this lofty goal is a long one. The Mishnaic tract, Pirkei Avot (the Ethics of the Fathers) admonishes us: "The task is long and the day is short; But, while it is not your duty to complete the task, neither are you free to shirk from completing your portion of it."

I am proud to be serving as the U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations at a time when the task is indeed long. I want you to know that the United States does not shirk from its obligations to the State of Israel. It is sometimes a hard and rocky road we traverse here. We expect to be weighed in the balance. I know we will be. I hope we will not be found wanting in defense of this just cause, in defense of our common values, in defense of freedom and justice. Thank you.

Ambassador NETANYAHU. Thank you Ambassador Walters, who together with the rest of the American mission—many of whom are here today with us—continues the good fight along the lines laid down by the distinguished American representatives from previous tenures who are here with us.

I'd like to say a word about the good fight. The good fight shows that if you resist, if you refuse to accept, if you fight back, if you tell people that you're going to fight back, you can get results.

I'm a little embarrassed to be an Israeli representative in this current assembly because—well, it's not that bad. We've had a few glittering successes in this General Assembly and we've had a series of unprecedented defeats for the Arabs. You remember 11 years ago Arafat came here to wild applause. He couldn't set his foot in the door this time. I also view this particular gathering as tremendously important, because it tells the entire world and it tells the United Nations that we refuse to accept the slander, we will fight back.

There was an attempt by some of the Arab delegates to block this gathering. Well, they failed. But in the protest that led up to that failure one Arab delegate was heard to comment, "The Zionists are invading the United Nations." For once he's right. And thank God for that.

Our next speaker, too, has labored mightily against falsehood and bigotry, has in his own way led the good fight. I watched him do that here when he was himself a member of the American delegation to the United Nations. And I watched him do this from afar when he helped lead the courageous American stand in Nairobi, with results that are well-known to all of you.

Ladies and gentlemen, the Assistant Secretary of State for International Organization Affairs, Ambassador Alan Keyes.

Ambassador KEYES. Thank you very much. I'd like to begin by saying how very pleased I am to be here today to bear witness to the fact that in this country and in the world we have not forgotten and we do understand the significance of what happened 10 years ago. I am also pleased to be here because I was able to have a part in what I hope will be the first step in the process of reversing the slander that was passed 10 years ago.

During the U.N. Decade of Women Conference in Nairobi this summer, the U.S. delegation insisted on the deletion from the conference's final document of any references to Zionism which implied acceptance of the defamatory equation of Zionism with racism. In order to achieve this aim we ultimately made clear our firm intention of walking out of the conference if these references were accepted. This stance reflected our deep conviction that the "Zionism-is-racism" equation represents a hateful slur against Jewish people everywhere and a key element of the campaign to delegitimize the State of Israel. It reflected the recognition that forces intensely hostile to the United States originated this campaign and are responsible for its perpetuation. It reflected comprehension of the fact that the destructive abuse of United Nations forums as weapons in this campaign constitutes a profound perversion of the right principles and practices of the organization—and a serious threat to its existence as a useful tool for building international peace.

The fight against the "Zionism-is-racism" equation is a fight for the dignity of the Jewish people. It is a fight for the interests of the United States, but it is also an integral part of the fight to save the soul and future of the United Nations.

The original passage of the "Zionism-is-racism" resolution marked an epoch in the history of the United Nations. It was not only a victory for the enemies of Israel and the United States, it was the triumph of a certain concept of the organization. According to this view the United Nations is merely a reflection of the existing international situation. The hostilities which afflict the globe find their inevitable repetition in the proceedings of the United Nations. Because the international situation is characterized by a fundamental conflict between inimical forces, the United Nations must become a stage for this conflict, an extension of the basic class struggle, a theater for war by other means.

In this view neither the principles nor the effective content of the United Nations work have any intrinsic value. They are useful only insofar as they can contribute to victory in the unrelenting struggles being waged outside its walls. This view of the United Nations is entirely consistent with both the ideology and the practices of the Soviet Union, the original U.N. sponsor of the "Zionism-is-racism" idea. Since the organization began, the Soviets have resisted its positive peacekeeping and humanitarian goals. They have for the most part refused to contribute to the support of U.N. peacekeeping operations. Their voluntary contributions to the U.N.'s humanitarian and development efforts have been negligible, falling in recent years well behind that of the major developing countries.

The "Zionism-is-racism" resolution was not therefore an isolated attack against Israel and the aspirations of the Jewish people. It was the expression of a view of the United Nations which systematically rejects the hope the organization is supposed to represent. This is the hope that human beings can, by conscious and purposeful effort escape the clutches of disastrous war. Rather than seeing the United

Nations as a mere extension of the theaters of war, those who share this hope conceive of it as a constructive instrument, a tool in the effort to build the habits and institutions of a peaceful world. Seen through the eyes of this hope the United Nations does not appear as the mirror image of a destructive co-relation of forces. It seems instead the fragile bridge to a future less preoccupied with human conflict, less burdened by human suffering and grief.

The common needs and mutual interests of peoples and states are the girders and beams of this bridge, its surface the universal recognition of the intrinsic value of an international system ordered by reciprocal respect for the rule of law. It supports the continuing belief of the world's people and the inherent worth of its existence.

Americans have always had a strong sense of the intrinsic value of the United Nations. Even today, after more than a decade in which the U.N. has been the arena for vicious assaults on American principles, values, and policies, Americans still retain the strong, almost instinctive desire to believe in the inherent worth of its existence. In some ways this is a projection of our own domestic experiment in internationalism, an experiment that would be doomed to failure if we did not ascribe intrinsic worth to the institutions that make possible our way of life. The respect we have for our Constitution and for the rule of law constrains the passionate differences between our various races, nationalities, and religions within the bounds of peaceful competition. Each participant in our society accepts in principle the idea that our basic political institutions are not merely convenient weapons in a historically inevitable war of all against all. The practical result of this acceptance is the strongly held public opinion that power, even when wielded by the majority of the people, must be limited in its exercise by respect for the values and principles that make these basic institutions possible.

We have always had a tendency to assume that the same habits of mind can be transferred to the United Nations environment. This is understandable insofar as the establishment of the United Nations implied the extension to the whole international arena of the principles of our domestic international society. Yet the success of this implied experiment in global constitutionalism requires that in principle all of the participants accept the idea that the United Nations charter and the norms of lawful international behavior have some intrinsic worth, are not merely convenient weapons in the inevitable struggle between classes, peoples, and states. Without this reciprocal and universal attitude of respect, the habits of mind that ensure domestic tranquility for us may become instead naive and dangerous reflexes that permit the United Nations and the system of international law and organization it implies to become a cruel con game in which the scrupulous behavior of those who respect its intrinsic worth is exploited as a fatal weakness by those who do not. When convenient, the norms and principles of the system are invoked by the latter to embarrass and demoralize the former. Otherwise they are systematically disregarded. The better instincts of the more scrupulous states thus become weapons in the struggle against their survival. Perhaps nothing is more offensive to moral sensibility than the exploitation of good intentions and deeds for destructive ends. This offends not only because of its immediate results but because it can discourage and corrupt the moral will.

The United Nations was established to promote peace. When it is used as a weapon of political warfare this not only injures those who are assaulted, it discourages and corrupts the moral commitment that is the mainstay of the organization's existence. The fight against the "Zionism-is-racism" idea in the United Nations is a key element in the general fight against this corruption. In the past this general fight has often been portrayed as an effort to prevent the excessive politicization of U.N. activities. However it is not a fight against politics per se but against the idea that in the United Nations it is acceptable to practice a brand of politics that is merely war in a thin disguise of parliamentary verbiage and procedure. One cannot overcome this idea by ignoring it.

This is the flaw in the supposedly sophisticated approach of those who believe that indifference is the best way to deal with U.N. polemics. The practitioners of political warfare in the United Nations will not desist so long as such warfare seems an easy path to psychological advantage and demoralization in the West. When that path is blocked by effective opposition, however, the calculus of their ambition may lead to the conclusion that attempting it is no longer worth the trouble.

How can we effectively oppose the idea that politics in the United Nations is merely war by other means? We can discourage it by making clear that we will respond effectively. We can make it less profitable by making each attack upon us costly and difficult. Attacks are always more tempting when small victories are easily won. It is always less tempting when the effort involves exposes the attackers' own weaknesses and vulnerabilities. Demonstrating an ability to take the offensive

against those weaknesses can, will, and has a deterrent effect. Ironically, therefore, the first step in opposing the idea that U.N. politics is merely political warfare is to become an effective U.N. warrior.

In the last several years the United States has made a successful effort in this regard. We will win no permanent victory for our opposition to this idea, however, until the other members of the United Nations and in particular the developing countries realize that whatever victories they or others may win in the U.N.'s political war, the world loses as long as the U.N. remains a battleground. In an important sense, this was the message the United States sent when we declared our determination to walk out of the Nairobi conference if the defamatory references to Zionism were not deleted. It is the message we sent when we declared our firm intention to withdraw from the General Assembly should the majority violate the U.N. charter by expelling the State of Israel. By these actions we cast into high relief the threat posed to the organization's existence by campaigns which put the pursuit of polemical advantage above respect for the intrinsic worth of the charter and the rule of law. The U.N. will make no effective contribution to the peace of the world until peace and truth are restored to its own deliberations.

The politics of the United Nations must reflect the idea that it is possible to build a peaceful world by peaceful mens, that despite differences among classes, peoples, and states, human relations need not be a condition of permanent warlike struggle. The U.N. was supposed to be an institution within whose framework this idea would become more than a pious abstraction, where enmities would be put aside as states and individuals learned through practice the intrinsic worth of peaceful cooperation. Clearly, this implies a determination on the part of all to overcome the passions that feed and perpetuate those enmities. The United Nations was not merely intended as a barometer of existing hatreds, a register of anger and indignation, a vent for helpless despair. The apologists who rely upon such uses to justify its existence degrade the hope that it is supposed to represent. Because we have not surrendered this hope, the Government and people of the United States will continue firmly to oppose those forces within the United Nations system who wish to substitute their own divisive victories for the victory of humankind.

We will continue to pursue that larger victory through our own insistence that the U.N. system focus on the task of building for peace. In the specialized agencies and conferences of the U.N. system we will continue to insist that topics, resolutions, and formulations that serve only polemical purposes be excluded. We will seek reforms throughout the system that will make such polemics more difficult, while focusing the attention and resources of the organization on the constructive humanitarian and development goals that most effectively enhance the skills and conditions for peace. We will stand for the positive meaning of the United Nations as the bridge between the grim world of our conflicting passions and the brighter world of our reciprocal hopes. It was with that in mind that we fought the battle in Nairobi. It was a good fight, not just because we fought the lie that Zionism is racism, not just because we fought those who would exploit that lie in order to undermine U.S. policy toward the Middle East, not only because we fought those who would exploit that lie in order to sow divisions among our own people here, blacks and Jews who have worked together through the centuries of this country's existence, in the days of slavery and civil rights, to bring justice and dignity to people in this land.

We fought that good fight because even then, when we fought together, we knew that it was not for ourselves as blacks or for ourselves as Jews that we fought. We fought for the dignity of all, for the hopes of all. And we still fight for those hopes as we will continue now to fight, to save that hope as it was supposed to be in this organization. It is that which, in my mind, the fight against the "Zionism-is-racism" idea represents and in that fight not only Jews and blacks and Americans and Israelis but all the member states of this organization should join if they care any longer about its true meaning. Thank you.

Ambassador NETANYAHU. Thank you, Ambassador Keyes, for an important speech that drew important distinctions, the distinctions between ends and means, the distinction that says that the unbridled resort to unjust means corrupts and distorts ends. President Herzog has already referred to the valiant defense of the truth at the critical hour by our next speaker. A few of our speakers today have done so as well. I suppose that in one sense we can say that we are all in the debt of our fathers, but I think we owe a special tribute to this padre, the former Representative of Costa Rica to the United Nations and its former Ambassador to Israel, Father Benjamin Nunez.

Ambassador NUNEZ. I have to fight against three problems, Mr. Chairman and distinguished members of the board, and ladies and gentlemen. First, who has time?

So, I have to fight that great obstacle. Second, I have to compete with Senator Moynihan in using English with a heavy Irish accent. Third, after hearing so great beautiful and good tidings from the major power of the Earth, you have to hear the representative of a very small simple country that has no army because we have eliminated it by constitution. A poor nation, peaceful, democratic, with a very difficult neighbor on our northern border. So, I cannot offer you as much, but I can offer you the moral, constant, permanent support of that small democracy of Latin America which is Costa Rica.

As you can see, I am a Catholic priest but I do not represent official views of the Catholic Church. I do express a growing sentiment of solidarity with the Jewish people, which is taking strength in the Catholic Church, particularly after the declaration "Nostra Aetate," which was made in 1965.

A new light in the darkness has been lighted by that declaration, and I hope that within that new light, is developing a change from the traditional negative attitude of the church that will help us in the fight against the consequences of the infamous Resolution 3779.

I am a Latin American and Costa Rican but I could not say that what I am going to say are the generalized feelings on the Latin American continent. Yes, Latin America has been the reservoir of friendship for Israel since its foundation. But I am afraid that this reservoir is being drained by three currents: black oil, red leftist movements, and the brown rebirth of neo-Nazism in many circles in Latin America.

I mention these three factors because they demand serious attention from the State of Israel and from the Zionist organizations in the world. The reservoir must be saved, and it is possible to maintain that loyalty to Israel and friendship to the Jewish people as in the past. But action must be taken.

I was present in that diplomatic circus on the afternoon of November 10, 1975. I raised my voice officially representing the government and personally because that's one of the aspects of my priesthood, which I have directed to help develop more friendly and brotherly relations with the Jewish people. And I have committed my energies to help Israel whenever it is necessary and possible to do so.

I saw how 72 countries sided with infamy, many of them totalitarian oligarchies, primitive despotisms. I saw how 32 countries could not or did not or were not permitted to side with truth and justice. If they had raised their hands, these hands would have prevented the scourge from falling on the chosen people of God. I saw also how 35 countries did, as my friend Moynihan called on them, stand up to defend the very essence of justice and human dignity.

Now what happened that afternoon is a conceptual aberration. The terms were not previously and properly defined. If a minimum degree of love and truth had abided in the minds of those who approved the infamous resolution, or a minimum respect for human dignity and human rights, a simple objective definition of the terms involved could have prevented the infamous resolution.

There is a juridical practice to define the terms of a legal instrument or a legal declaration binding peoples. At that time a bishop from Caracas, Monsignor Alfredo Rodrigez explicitly rejected the resolution on the grounds that, as he said, the question was debated and handled without the previous definition and determination of the terms "Zionism" and "racism." I think the conceptual aberration continues because not enough light has been thrown on the definition of these two terms.

Let us give today, to the peoples of the Earth, the correct definition of these two terms. Of course it was the strategy of the devil to renew anti-Semitism and anti-Judaism. It was also a political plot to discredit Israel and to eliminate Israel. But on this matter I know many other people will talk a little more and more properly.

Now if it was a conceptual aberration, ex post facto clarification of terms should discover the falsehood contained in the declaration. First they had to define "racism," but they never did. In fact "racist" is not a scientific term at all. Jews are not a race. I know what it is to live in Israel and see the many, many faces of the people of Israel—and all of them are Jews.

You know the high classes, who have their own culture, do not approve of marriage of members of their class to members of the lower classes. For that reason are they racist? In sociology we call this "endogamy" and "exogamy." "Endogamy" is the rule in which people demand that members of that people marry within the group. "Exogamy" is to allow people to marry out of the group. But this "endogamy" and "exogamy," which is applied to all human groups, when used by the culture of the Jewish people is considered "racism." You see, the double standard used to judge the Jewish people.

Now we know that many of those who voted for the resolution never read anything on Zionism. They just voted because they thought Zionism to be a bad thing. In fact, Zionism is a cultural definition for a people who want to live according to

the principles and requirements of their culture. Zionism refers to Zion, not metaphysically or geographically but spiritually. It asks all the Jews of the world to live according to their own values. Let me say that if I am a fighter for Zionism, it is because I am a religious man.

True liberation must be preceded by cultural affirmation, by the spiritual affirmation of your own being as a people. And Zionism should be defined as a national liberation movement.

It is strange that among these nations that voted against Zionism were so many who only recently had acquired their nationhood. You know that Israel was one of the frontrunners of nationalism in that part of the world. The struggle that the Jews began at the end of the last century was part of that great movement that destroyed the Ottoman Empire and the British Empire, too—the last empires of history.

Yet I think that the resolution, as bad as it is, has had two good effects. One is to awaken the Jewish people spiritually speaking, that is one of the most important effects of the infamous resolution. To awaken a people and tell them, "Be careful. Wherever you are, you're a Jew. And you must live according to this Jewish, spiritual philosophy." Remember, I'm talking as a priest. They say I'm a politician, and maybe they are right, but in this case I am fighting for Zionism out of my spiritual convictions.

The second positive effect has been to awaken the free conscience of mankind in other parts of the world toward a people that has been persecuted and denied the right to have a national expression in a sovereign state like Israel.

So first, we have to counterattack by showing the falsehood of the resolution. Any kind of action to spread the truth must be carved out. We have to see if those countries that voted against the resolution, are still in the same position—and we must keep them in that position. As to states that abstained, maybe some of them have repented.

I remember once a meeting in Geneva with the Socialists of Europe. Golda Meir was there telling them how badly they had behaved with Israel during the Yom Kippur war, and no one made any comment. One person present asked her, "Madame, why don't they speak out?" And she replied, "Because they have their throats full of oil."

I am sure some of those countries that voted for the resolution, would welcome a reversal of their position. Of course it would be difficult to get the Arab countries, the Communist countries, to reverse their position. But many of the others might indeed do so.

The history of mankind is a fight between light and darkness. The same fight continues. Let us use our hearts and our minds to produce more and more light in the world and assure that the darkness will be expelled. I finish by repeating with all my heart what I said 10 years ago. You must continue fighting and strengthening your hearts for the sacred ideals and dreams of Zion. Nothing and nobody will be able to stop you because it is not only your fight, it is the fight of all free men of good will. In your long history you have survived worse resolutions, and you will survive this one too. Don't lose your faith, your courage, your hope, in the decency of human beings.

Ambassador NETANYAHU. Thank you, Father Nunez for that impassioned plea. We respect and value the important statement that you gave, the statement that says that if a people is not allowed to have its history, if it's not allowed to have its culture, it is lobotomized. Its brain and its soul are removed. We must be allowed to treasure our particular ethic, our particular values. This is what this battle is all about.

The next speaker is a true champion of liberty. He does not care for fashion. He does not care for personal advantage. He cares only for justice and for truth. And for all those who know him and for all the friends of freedom, he is that rarest of beings, a truly noble man. Ladies and gentlemen, the chairman of the A. Philip Randolph Institute, Bayard Rustin.

BAYARD RUSTIN. That resolution, amongst other things, obscures the true nature of racism and thereby does the most grave damage to men and women everywhere who fight against it. It is to me significant that there were many nations including African states that were and are, in fact, engaged in racism against their own tribal peoples—who voted for that resolution. But even more terrifying to me was the fact that the majority of the nations of the Middle East that are Arab voted for it, when they were the instigators of slavery in this world hundreds of years ago. And when in fact they are at this moment, according to the London-based Anti-Slavery Society, still engaged in the practice of slavery.

Now my friends I believe this was a most terrifying resolution because it obscures the Judaic revelation that there is one God and one humanity, which revelation was absolutely essential to the founding of the State of Israel and is related to Israel's very existence. And to strike down that relationship is the gravest of dangers.

It is because I believe that so deeply that I will talk mostly about why I feel that this was such a horrible thing to have occurred. And I do not believe I begin with Jews who will be terrorized by it. I begin fearing for myself and for my people and for our struggle.

For 300 years intelligent black Americans have had the highest respect for Judaism and Jews. Because when we came from Africa we were stripped of our hope. We were stripped of our tradition. We were stripped of our language. But the one thing that we could cling to, borrow from the Jew and adhere to, was the notion that the Jew—not the Phoenecian nor the Greek, nor the Roman but the Jew—had placed before us: there is one God and one humanity.

And in fact my friends we borrowed the book of the Jew. We borrowed the tales of the Talmud. We borrowed and invested in our song for liberation in this world far more that is Judaic than is Christian. Any assault upon that is an assault upon me and any other person wherever he is in this world, because if there is an assault upon the notion of one God, one humanity, there can be no human rights left.

When my mother wanted us to be patient she called our attention to the spirituals, and every Saturday morning we would go through the book of spirituals. If there was impatience in the family she would read "Oh Mary, don't you weep, don't you mourn, for Pharaoh's army indeed got drowned." If there was need for perseverence in our family, she turned to another spiritual, "Joshua fit the battle of Jericho, and the walls came tumbling down." And then she would say, "You have to be patient because Joshua didn't go around once, he went around seven times." And I shall never forget the times when we were discussing loyalty. The great phrase that my grandmother constantly repeated to us in terms of loyalty was, "Whither thou goest, I will go. Whither thou lodgest, I will lodge. Thy people shall be my people, and thy God my God." Never a wedding took place in our family without the bride and the groom repeating that. That did not come from the bowels of Africa but from the experience of the Jewish people, which we had gathered.

Or if we were discussing friendship, she would say, "Hand me the Book." And she would read to us. I remember on one occasion when I had been very unkind to a friend, and she sat me down in the kitchen. I can still smell the cinnamon toast. And she read to me of David and Jonathan.

No black person who lived through the 1960's or through the aftermath of the Civil War can ever move far away from the spiritual "Go Down Moses." And if you will check Martin Luther King's major speeches, one-third of them conclude with the words, "As surely, my friends, as Moses brought the Hebrew children out of Egypt into the promised land, you too will be free."

Now, my friends, we blacks had no river that we could be fond of. Surely not the Mississippi. What Paul Robeson said about it was, "You work on it all day. You toil. They beat you. And if in return you get a little drunk, then they throw you in jail." Ours was the River Jordan. "Roll, Jordan, roll." That is the river which chills the body but warms the soul. Or better still, "Deep River." "Deep river, deep, deep river. My home is over Jordan. Deep river, Lord, I want to be carried to the promised land." That was our river. The liberation of black people eternally said "You've got one more river to cross. And that is the Jordan. And you will be home."

And then it was not easy to look upon Washington, DC, as our capital. That is where they declared in the Supreme Court that we were to remain slaves. That is where we could have no representatives. That is where people met but we could not vote. And so we adopted, "Oh what a beautiful city, Oh what a righteous city, Oh what a peaceful city. Twelve gates to Jerusalem. Hallelujah."

Now you Jews who know anything about the gates of Jerusalem will forgive us for making extra gates. But I would like to conclude my remarks by merely saying that a religion which produced rabbis who stood with us as Rabbi Arthur Lelyveld did and was beaten to the ground, a religion and a country related to it that produced two New York young men who came with us to Mississippi and were lynched; a people and their religion who contributed more to Dr. Martin Luther King than all the Christians combined, when his back was to the wall I will remind us that we must do all we can to fight this terrible thing and to bow our heads.

KENNETH J. BIALKIN. Before returning to the program, I'd like to say something personally to Bayard Rustin. In the early 1960's, when a black man named James Meredith was shot walking on a highway in Mississippi, I was among many other Jewish people who were affronted by the notion that a free person couldn't walk on a highway, and who went down to Mississippi and walked on that highway with

many others. Today, in the course of time, many people might think twice about doing such a thing. But not if Bayard Rustin were leading and Alan Keyes, and I would just like to say personally that that is the kind of leadership, of principle and of morality that many of us would put aside the issues of the moment to follow to the ends of the Earth. God bless you, Bayard, for what you say and do.

Those who dominate the General Assembly have learned that it is far easier to live by slogan and slander, to engage in cynical moralizing and to criticize Israel's effort to achieve a living and working arrangement with her neighbors than it is to examine the root causes of the misery and the dangers that threaten and afflict millions of the oppressed peoples of the world. The genocide proceeds in Afghanistan, the Persian Gulf is aflame in the senseless war which has so far claimed upward of a million casualties. The effort to relieve famine and distress in several African nations is frustrated by local wars and revolutions, official corruption and political obstruction. Peoples, even nations, are decimated in Southeast Asia by a cruel political and ethnic oppression, which is staggering in its ferocity, which hardly engaged official attention. International terrorism involving attacks on innocent civilians, disruptions of international travel and the murders of diplomats and other officials is aided and abetted by governments that provide diplomatic cover and shelter to the major terrorist organizations. Growing economic distress and instability threaten the world financial and economic order, and the threat of nuclear weapon proliferation grows. A troublesome growth in religious fundamentalism and an apparent diminution of religious tolerance and a growing acceptance of radical extremism add a new dimension to the threat of totalitarianism in many parts of the world.

Yet the valuable time and energy of the U.N. has been stolen by attacks on Israel. We may properly ask why. Why the focus on Zionism? Why the focus on Israel? Why has this subject become the focus of such universal attention?

The "Zionism-is-racism" slogan is grounded in anti-Semitism and its propaganda is itself a manifestation of anti-Semitism and of racism. Its supporters transform a political issue—the dispute between Israel and its neighbors—into a social, religious, ethnic, emotional cause. How many other political questions facing the international community generate this intensity of feeling and virulence of expression? Anti-Semitism is a negative force which saps the energy of the hater, clouds the mind of the thinker, fouls the mouth of the speaker and weakens the morality and resolve of the community. The campaign against Zionism has consumed its enemies and has prevented them from progressing toward a better life for their people. It is time to face the reality of modern Zionism: that the Jewish people have a right to live in peace and dignity in their ancient places, and that the right-thinking peoples of the world will support them in that endeavor. The full force of this anti-Semitism falls on the Jews of Israel, they are in the front line. But make no mistake, anti-Semitism is an attack on Jews everywhere, and must be recognized for what it is, and so is anti-Zionism. The institutionalized anti-Semitism reflected by the "Zionism-is-racism" resolution amounts to an attack on truth and, as Ambassador Walters said, "is a threat to freedom everywhere."

If irrational movements are permitted to go unchallenged, reason and balance and therefore freedom itself are severely threatened. The free people of the world must join to combat these dark forces. We must insist on the repeal of the evil resolution. We must identify those who are responsible and who assist and support them and call them to account for their deeds. To do less would be to surrender to those who would deny our freedoms.

Now, to continue our program, I want to introduce a very special person. He is a man who came—out of Zionist fervor—from Ethiopia to Israel 14 years ago and was there to welcome the modern exodus from Ethiopia of his fellow Jews. I would like to present Mr. Rahamim Elazar, the Secretary General of the National Council of Ethiopian Jews in Israel.

RAHAMIM ELAZAR. As a proud Jew and a citizen of the State of Israel, I am honored to take part in this conference. I know, because I have lived it in my own life, that the point of Zionism is freedom. I know, because I have lived it, that the point of Zionism is the heritage of the Jewish people and the ingathering of the Jewish people from all over the world without regard to color or religion.

I came to Israel from Africa, and I have lived there now for 14 years. For all these years, I have enjoyed all the rights and benefits of Israeli citizenship and I have been proud to fulfill all my obligations. I have always been an equal among equals, a Jew among fellow Jews. My life is living proof that Zionism is not racism. Zionism is equality.

In the course of my life in Israel, I have achieved two university degrees, I have graduated from the major school of journalism and I have worked in many distinguished Israeli institutions. Coming to Israel was the fulfillment of my lifelong

dream to return to my own ancient homeland. My family of 10 brothers and sisters and my parents joined me only recently. All of them came, as I did, of their own free choice to become proud citizens of the State of Israel. Today there are many thousands of Jews who have come from my country to Israel, and they are already showing extraordinary achievements in their new homeland. Many are attending universities, as I did, serving as nurses, living as members of kibbutzim or contributing to many of Israel's advanced industries.

Although my people had lived in their land for over 2,000 years, they were still called strangers or aliens. It was a term of contempt. In contrast, in Israel we are treated as Jews among Jews, as free men and women in our homeland regardless of color or place of origin. The values of my people include a spiritual and mystical Zionism that comes from our holy book, the Bible. Our heritage taught us that to go to the State of Israel was the fulfillment of God's commandment. For us, Zionism means the fulfillment of our ancient dream, an end to the tragedy of our long exile. For us, Zionism means the redemption of the Jewish people. For us, Zionism means the ingathering in the State of Israel of the Jewish people from all over the world. For us, Zionism means the ultimate dream of the Jewish people—black and white—to overcome racism.

Mr. BIALKIN. Thank you very much, Mr. Elazar. For those of us who have followed the literature and journalism of the Middle East, the name of Conor Cruise O'Brien is not new. Mr. O'Brien has been one of the learned thinkers and clear writers, one of the objective and intellectually incisive observers who honors the profession of journalism and does much to offset the criticism of journalistic inadequacies or excesses. Mr. O'Brien was former Deputy Chief of Ireland's U.N. delegation and has earned a worldwide reputation as a writer and observer. It is my deep pleasure to introduce him to you now.

CONOR CRUISE O'BRIEN. Mr. Chairman, your program identifies me as a former representative of Ireland at the United Nations, which is quite correct. I should, however, make it absolutely clear that I have no public representative capacity in relation to Ireland or anything else now. I speak here for nothing except what is going on in my own head.

I was drawn to the study of Zionism in fairly recent years as a result of a lifelong interest in the complex relationships of religion and nationalism, and also as a result of sitting in the General Assembly of the United Nations over a period of years in the special political committee, which was then seized by what was called the question of the Palestine refugees, but was in fact the Arab-Israeli dispute. I am particularly glad that this conference is taking place right here at the United Nations, in a room I know well. This should remind us of what some of us sometimes forget, that the United Nations is not the General Assembly. The General Assembly does not make up the United Nations, nor when the General Assembly speaks has the United Nations spoken, still less decided. It is very important to keep that distinction. It was not "the United Nations" that 10 years ago passed that crass and cruel resolution, which gave aid and comfort not only to political opponents of Israel but also to anti-Semites of all descriptions, wherever they exist. It was not, I repeat, the United Nations that passed that resolution. It was merely the General Assembly of the United Nations. I know that some of you may understandably feel that the distinction is not important, that all that is involved is some kind of procedural quibble. But I don't think that is the case. I think that the distinction is significant.

Israel is in a much stronger position, through its friendship with the United States, in its relation to the United Nations as a whole, than it is to the General Assembly. And that reality is symbolized by our meeting place today. If the General Assembly were the United Nations, we could hardly, I think, be meeting under the roof of the United Nations. Friends of Israel should be alert to that distinction and also to the fact that strict construction of the charter which puts the General Assembly firmly below the Security Council is in the interest of Israel and its friends in contemporary circumstances.

In the late 195O's, in the post-Suez and Sinai period, it began to crumble, so that Ernest W. LeFevre wrote in 1957—in a book on religion and international politics—"Cool it boys stop saying that the General Assembly is so great because you may not have a majority much longer."" (Crude facts, not often cited.) Then, in 1958, it actually happened.

Now, 1958 is a very important year in the history of the relations of the United States, the United Nations, and Israel that triangular relationship with which we are concerned here. For what happened that year on July 14 was the revolution in Baghdad, and it is important for the sequels to those events at the United Nations itself. And, curiously enough, changes which you might not think would be at all beneficial to Israel, were beneficial to Israel. First of all the Baghdad pact blew up

in the place named after it. That meant that those officials who have in various ways conceived the interest of the United States to be closely identifiable with those of certain Arab leaders were set back, and that influence was diminished. More important, public opinion in the West generally came to see that there is a difference between the friendship of a regime as in Iraq and the friendship of a people as in Israel. One can change overnight if it is the regime, it can go like that. A country which was formerly thought of as friendly—bang, it's gone, it's now very unfriendly indeed! An alarming situation. And those whose business it was to study those things knew that that couldn't happen in the case of Israel, because it is not just a regime, it is the people of Israel, through its democratic government, which is friendly to the West. That led to a reassessment favorable to Israel and I think on the whole it has lasted. In that sense the year 1958 was a great turning point. You will remember that less than 2 years earlier the situation of Israel had been very perilous indeed in the aftermath of Suez.

But there was also a change—and this has been much less remarked—in the relation between the United States and the General Assembly. As I mentioned, until then there was a safe two-thirds. In August 1958, at the emergency meeting of the General Assembly following the Anglo-American landings in Lebanon and Jordan, for the first time a resolution put forward with the backing of the West failed of a two-thirds, fulfilling the prophecy made by Ernest W. LeFevre the previous year.

In stressing the distinction I do not intend to try to sentimentalize or glorify the United Nations. The U.N. has never, at any time, been anything more than a loose association of governments—not directly nations, but governments including the superpowers. It can be made use of by governments for purposes that can be either good or bad, and often a bit of both. All the governments concerned are pursuing primarily their own interests. Many of the governments concerned are quite nasty and some of them are very nasty indeed. So, it is quite wrong, to impute moral authority to the decisions of the United Nations. It is idolatrous to impute some kind of infallible moral authority to any government, even a decent government. Governments are not sources of moral authority. They are to be judged by moral standards, by their citizens, and by others. That is a fundamental principle, and the better the government is, the more the government will accept that principle, as I belie the Government of Israel accepts it and the Government of the United States and that group of countries which are called the decent countries.

But if it is idolatrous to impute decisive moral authority to even a decent government, what can be thought about imputing decisive moral authority to an association of governments at the United Nations? The most that can be said for the institution is that it does represent the recognition by governments that they have at least a certain common interest. (I put this narrowly because I think it must be put narrowly)—a certain common interest in not destroying the world. And the recognition, however imperfect, of that common interest is something that we can't afford to lose. Israel is fully justified in pursuing its own interests at the United Nations, as other countries do, but I believe also that Israel, to a greater extent than most other nations—by reason of its history and the history of the Jewish people—is also imbued with a sense of the common human interest: in the interest in survival for us all as humans.

It is important, however, to take a cool look at the claim of the United Nations, and especially of the General Assembly, to some form of overriding moral authority. It was after all that aura of moral authority, diminishing since the 1950's but still around to some extent 10 years ago and even now, which lends that special horror to that General Assembly resolution of November 10: The collective statement of an association of governments, many of which were obviously and even extravagantly devoid of any moral authority whatever. I am afraid we have to admit that a large part of the responsibility for that attribution of moral authority comes from the interest of the West in the early years of the Assembly. It is impossible to understand the towering moral stature imputed to the United Nations and to the General Assembly of the United Nations over rather more than the first decade of its existence unless we also understand that during that period, the General Assembly, because of its original composition, had a safe anti-Soviet majority—a safe two-thirds for any pro-Western resolution judged of sufficient importance. That was the main fact of life about the General Assembly in those days. And the inevitable propaganda aspect of that fact of life was that Western spokesmen were unfortunately habitually drawn to impute inordinate ethical importance to declarations of the General Assembly.

It is a fact that if an institution or a group is likely to agree with you, you are likely to think that they are jolly fine fellows. That's universal. So, it was in those days, and I remember hearing those words myself as a member of the General As-

sembly and being perplexed and somewhat overcome by them. It was proclaimed that the General Assembly was "the moral conscience of mankind." Thus, was an excessive and undeserved validity inadvertently conferred on an unknown series of future declarations by that body, including the resolution of November 10, 1975. If the moral authority of the United Nations is a kind of monster, I am afraid that monster was created by a Western Frankenstein. He didn't mean, of course, to invent it, but then Frankenstein in the book didn't mean it either. So, that situation was known as the safe two-thirds.

I have suggested that Israel's position at the United Nations as distinct from the General Assembly is stronger than might appear. Even the hostility of the General Assembly constitutes in certain respects resources on which Israel can draw when they are most needed. The United Nations is first and foremost a theater in which versions of world politics are from time to time presented and enacted. These versions may be distortions, but are nonetheless of some significance. Indeed, I sometimes wondered whether a certain degree of indulgence on President Reagan's part toward the United Nations may not be due to his recognition of it as essentially a theater. I realize, however, that for much of its proceedings, the United Nations is an extremely boring theater. If it charged admission and had to live on the sale of tickets, its run would have ended a good many years back. (The Arab countries those which like to attack Israel, which is no longer quite all of them have been boring the Assembly for a good many years now. I was there in the days of Ahmed Shukairy who could have won a Nobel prize for boredom.) Under certain conditions, as in the fight that overtook large sections of the world after the use of the so-called oil weapon after 1973, the boredom can be replaced by a similitude of rapt attention and by the right kind of votes. But that, I think, is running down, and the boredom is beginning to register. (Delegates to the United Nations have an exceptionally high threshold of boredom; they have wonderful stamina in that respect, and indeed that is the most admirable characteristic perhaps of many of them.) Now, it is true that in the self-scripted dramatic performances on the East River, Israel has been cast in the role of villain permanent heavy, heavy No. 1. The primary audience for the drama is the American people watching television. And before that audience, the fact that Israel seems to be unpopular with most of the rest of the cast, does Israel no harm whatever, in my opinion. Rather the contrary. Israel's representatives have made great and classical use of that stage in the past. (One thinks of Abba Eban, in particular.) So, it would not be in Israel's interest to abandon that potentially powerful stage wholly to its adversaries. The adversaries command most of the speaking roles, but that does not mean that the performance necessarily works in their favor. I don't think it does, and I don't think it has in the past, because they tend to overreach themselves. It works the other way for the basic and simple reason that the hearts of most of that crucially important audience are not on the side of Israel's traducers, but on the side of the traduced party—Israel itself. That is the force that the adversaries of Israel unwittingly and unwisely evoke against their own cause. As I have found in my studies of Zionism and Israel, the bitterest enemies of Zionism and Israel have, through ill-judged words and actions, on many occasions hurt themselves and actually helped Israel. That is a strange thought, but it is one to be borne in mind as we consider Israel's relations to the United Nations. I am, myself, a secular thinker, but it is impossible to think about Israel without also being aware of this constant dimension of religion and of mystery, always present where Israel and the history of Israel is concerned. So, perhaps the best thought to cling to as we contemplate this strange institution of the United Nations is that God works in a mysterious way. Thank you.

Mr. BIALKIN. Thank you very much, Mr. O'Brien. In introducing the next speaker, I want to say a word or two about the origin of this conference, because they are really intertwined. These things don't happen by themselves. Somebody has an idea, somebody pushes the idea, somebody solves the problems and provides the energy to keep the idea going. In this case the credit for the idea and the energy and the force goes to Benjamin Netanyahu. As you know, this conference is sponsored by the Israeli Mission to the United Nations, which is indeed the reason for our being here. In doing so I want to express my appreciation to the entire organized Jewish community. This was a project the Conference of Presidents, organized and coordinated under the direction of my good colleague, Yehuda Hellman, who worked night and day with representatives of many of the member organizations of the Conference.

I do want you to know that in the putting together of this effort, it was a coordinated program representative of the entire community. But that does not diminish the imaginativeness and the energy that this very dynamic ambassador has brought to the project, and so it is a double pleasure at this moment to introduce Ambassador Netanyahu.

Ambassador NETANYAHU. I for one, having sat like some of my colleagues here in long sessions of the U.N., will certainly understand and recognize the injunction against boredom. Moments of lack of boredom, of real interest, do not happen often. One such moment happened 10 years ago. For a moment on that day the ghosts of Torquemada, Chmielnicki, and Goebbels weren't bored. They joined together in rejoicing, because what they failed to do in the Inquisition, in the great pogroms of the 17th century, in the Holocaust, was apparently achieved by a General Assembly resolution in the United Nations. I have to say that Mr. O'Brien's comments are correct. There is no reason why this body should have a moral authority, but it does. It does still, not in this country, certainly not in my country, and not in parts of Western Europe, but for over a hundred nations this body is a source not only of moral authority but also of historical truth. They rewrite history every day. So, we should not lose sight of the importance of what was achieved here, in the negative sense: no previous assault on the Jewish people ever attained an aura of respectability among the nations. But what you had here on November 10, 1975, was a sudden opportunity for the practitioners of an ancient hatred. They operated like thieves in the night. Pat Moynihan has described some of the machinations. The Soviet and Arab delegates took over, they hijacked the Conference of Women in Mexico City sponsored by the U.N. and they forced it to adopt one of the great slanders of history. And then they brought it here to this building and had an obedient General Assembly confirm it. And how did they achieve this? Through a very simple technique of *realpolitik*—by brutal political and economic intimidation. This was, you will remember, a year or two after the height of the Arab oil embargo. It appeared that nothing could stand in their way, certainly if they aligned themselves with each other. Nothing, apparently, did stand in their way. And many countries, too many countries that should have known better, that did know better, simply succumbed.

Now, why was it important for the Soviets and the Arabs? Why was it so important for them to wage this kind of campaign? They knew very well that Israel's strength is not rooted in its numbers, its size or its resources. They knew that the Jewish people's strength is in our moral passion and the belief in the justice of our cause. This is what distinguishes us from other peoples. Zionism is a unique moral phenomenon. The Jewish people have suffered degradation, humiliation, oppression, and mutilation like no other people, for it was we who first introduced to the world the idea that no man is a slave. The idea that we are our brother's keeper began with us. Cain asked God, "Am I my brother's keeper?" The answer came back with stunning clarity. It was never heard before. It's never been improved on since. And this is an idea that revolutionized history. When Moses struck down the Egyptian guard who had beaten a slave, this changed the course of history. Nothing like that was ever seen before—not in the vast despotisms of the East, in Syria, Babylon and Persia, where slavery reigned, not even in Athens where democracy was for the selected few, and where the great Aristotle said slaves were mechanical beasts of burden.

Bayard Rustin is right. This is what he drew on and this is what Zionism drew on—the tradition of liberty and equality, the idea that all men were forged in the image of God. It is this idea, this passion, this resistance to evil, this fight for freedom and justice that is the extraordinary contribution of the Jewish people. And it led them after two millenia of suffering to seek their own liberation. In the process, they helped the struggles of blacks, the struggles of workers in Europe, and the national liberation struggles throughout the 19th century. In Italy in the 19th century there were only several thousand Jews, but in the movement for Italian liberation many of the leaders were Jewish. This repeats itself in other lands. So, the Jews fought for liberty, for relief from oppression, for the independence of others and finally they said, we have to fight for our own independence. We have to come back to our historic homeland and live again as a free nation. This was the true, and this was the only, meaning of Zionism. And it was understood this way not only by the Jewish people, but by everyone. The discussion we are having today would have been absolutely inconceivable in 1920, 1930 or 1940, 1950, 1960, even though the Arab opposition was there. It would have been scoffed at because it would have been considered absurd. It was absurd, it is absurd.

This nearly universal acclamation of Zionism transferred itself to many peoples and many nations. They marveled at Israel's and Zionism's tenacity and courage. There was not only admiration but love for the Zionist ideals. The African movement modeled its own liberation, the Pan African movement, on Zionism. W.E.B. DuBois, the American black leader, talked about Zionism as a model for the black liberation movement. He said that in 1919, and many others said the same thing decades later. They applauded the courage and later the achievement of Israel in rebuilding an ancient homeland. They thrilled at Israel's ability to absorb exiles

from a hundred nations, to absorb them not only physically, but spiritually—to draw on the best of their contributions and to integrate them into the modern Jewish state. I think what most amazed them, and still does, was the unmatched ability of Israel to maintain its human and democratic ethic in the face of the most remorseless assault that any people or state has been subjected to in history.

None of these truths was lost on the Arabs or the Soviets. They understood that our moral stature is our greatest shield, and what they sought to do was first to tarnish that shield, then to crack it and ultimately to crush it. They chose vilification as their weapon. I must tell you that I don't believe they did this only to strike at Israel and at Zionism. Of course they had that political motivation. But I think something much deeper was working here. I think that deep down they also felt an unforgiving resentment. Because nothing unmasks the despots and dictators who hide behind the garb of rhetoric about national liberation and self-determination like a genuine national liberation movement. This is what Israel and Zionism held up to their faces every day, exposing the sham of their claims. This attack against the Jewish people and their state is not entirely new. But there was here one central difference, which we had not seen before in history: Until then anti-Semitism found its principal lodging in one country at a time. It moved over the centuries from England to Spain, and from there to France and from there to Germany and most recently, of course, to Russia. But here we had something new. Here we had a situation where anti-Semites could exploit a global apparatus through which they could disseminate their poison to five continents.

I entirely agree with Conor Cruise O'Brien that this body shouldn't have such authority. Perhaps it does because the other instruments of universal authority—principally religion—gradually declined. And the secular ideas gradually moved up. The idea of the secular universal brotherhood took the place of many other notions of authority. The abuse of this prestige has cost us a great deal in four-fifths of the world. But it has also poisoned the United Nations itself. In fairness, even without the obsessive campaign against Israel, the U.N.'s shortcomings are painfully obvious on this 40th anniversary.

We should single out the General Assembly, because it has been the repository of this bogus authority. What can we say of an assembly that has failed to curb, in the slightest way, the invasion of Afghanistan, which so far has claimed 1 million lives and 5 million refugees * * * an assembly that has not even lifted a finger to stop the sickening war between Iran and Iraq in which another million people have been slaughtered or maimed and in which poison gas has been used? Nor is it easy to forgive the General Assembly for its failure to address—let alone remedy—the genocidal bloodbath in Cambodia, the greatest holocaust since the Jewish Holocaust in World War II, or the massacre of half a million refugees in Uganda, or the gross violations of human rights in the Soviet Union. These are all in flagrant violation of the U.N.'s own Universal Declaration of Human Rights. But everything that I have described so far are acts of omission. This is just one of the reasons why the resolution we are discussing today is so different. It is an act of commission. What it does is to lay the groundwork for future horrors even more ominous than the ones that we have been speaking about. It may be tempting to dismiss this document as a meaningless absurdity that is destined for the dust bin of history. I think it would be a tragic mistake to do so. I have to stress this again. This is the first time in history that a world body has given its stamp of approval to the libeling of an entire people. We cannot forget what the spread of such libel means.

I don't think the Holocaust could have happened without the spread of an insidious libel. It wasn't only the physical power of the Nazis that made it possible. Had they not succeeded in brainwashing thousands and thousands of ordinary Germans and non-Germans in the various countries that came under their control, had they not succeeded in convincing them that the Jews were subhuman, a different species, not deserving the kinds of rights or accorded the kind of dignity that all other peoples deserve, I don't think the Nazis would have been able to move the machinery of genocide with that facility and with that speed. The machinery moved because the libel greased the way. We know one or two countries where there was no collaboration with such brainwashing. Denmark is a shining example, and in fact the Jews there were saved. In other words, such a libel is a prelude to murder. It is a license to kill. It separates a whole people from the rest of humanity. It makes their lives dispensable. It makes their killer immune.

You can bet that the libel of Zionism equals racism is exactly the same libel spread by the Nazis. It is the same vile and murderous anti-Semitism dressed up in a trendy terminology. What is the bitter truth? It's that the universal recognition of the horrors of the Holocaust hasn't made anti-Semitism unfashionable. It just made some of the old terminology a little embarrassing. What we have come to have is

that Zionism and Zionist now serve as euphemisms for Judaism and Jew and since there is no worse epithet in today's lexicon then "racist," it is the term used now to replace the whole gamut of old-fashioned invective. It's the modern version of Christ-killers and traitors, usurers, international conspirators. It should also not surprise us that the same regimes that so enthusiastically sponsored the "Zionism-racism" resolution are the ones that currently print and distribute some of the old-fashioned stuff too, like the infamous anti-Semitic forgery "Protocols of the Elders of Zion," which can be found on bookshelves in Arab capitals, in the Soviet Union, and in a few other countries, like Iran. If anyone doubts that Zionism in this context is anything but a code word, the killing of innocent diners in a Jewish restaurant in Paris, or the bombing of a Jewish home for the aged in Copenhagen, or the murder of Leon Klinghoffer should have disabused you.

I thought there was a moment after Leon Klinghoffer's murder when it seemed that at last the world recognized those who sponsored this resolution and those who directed hijackers were one and the same. For a moment it seemed to me at least that what the killing of the children in Ma'alot and the athletes in Munich failed to do, what the bombings of school buses and the hijackings of planes failed to do, the coldblooded murder of a pensioner in a wheelchair finally did. It laid bare the special relish they take in killing people who are Jewish. It showed these murderers for what they really are—the most faithful and enthusiastic heirs of the Nazis. I said that I think that some of this began to permeate. Slowly the civilized world may indeed be turning a corner, and not only because of the shock of recent events. A growing number of countries are coming to realize that even in the U.N., even in the General Assembly, excess has its limits, and that some falsehoods must be resisted. For one thing they are laughable. It is ridiculous to simply acquiesce to the Zionism-racism slander as if the rescue of the Ethiopian Jews never happened. As if the reality that Israel is the first and only state in history that has ever transported blacks out of Africa—not to enslave them, but to liberate them—hasn't made an extraordinary impression on the world. Not only Western nations but many Third World countries don't want to appear ridiculous and don't want to suffer the public censure. This explains the blocking of the Zionism-racism clause in the Nairobi conference, and the refusal to invite Arafat here. This explains the growing support that I and my colleagues in the Israeli Mission are now experiencing in the General Assembly in recent days.

I fully agree with what Conor Cruise O'Brien said about using this body to our advantage, but we must recognize two things. First, we have to refuse to be lepers. You see, if you go into this hall and you think of yourself as a pariah you will be a pariah. We refuse to be lepers, we refuse to accept the slander. And from that follows the opportunity to make our case before the world. That is why we are here today. We are here to make the case of truth, because against the big lie you can only pit one thing—the big truth.

Mr. BIALKIN. Ladies and gentlemen you've heard a message of one who refuses to be intimidated, a delegation and a nation determined to fight back. The message is that the fight must not be limited to the delegation of the State of Israel but must be waged by every free-minded person, every fair-minded person. It's time to call the doers of evil, the supporters of evil and those who aid or abet evil, to account. We identify them, we name them and we don't let them forget.

Now, for our next and final speaker, the best introduction I can give to our good friend Jeane Kirkpatrick is to say that the genius of the organizers of this conference is demonstrated by the fact that they realized the best and perhaps the only way of maintaining this company to the end was to ask Jeane to speak last.

It is with a great deal of pleasure that I call on the former Ambassador to the United Nations, our friend and heroine, Jeane Kirkpatrick.

Ambassador KIRKPATRICK. Like Conor Cruise O'Brien, I represent only myself here today, with my commitments and whatever views I have developed above all in the last 5 years about these problems. Ten years ago, when the "Zionism-is-racism" resolution passed the General Assembly, it was almost as if everyone understood it to be tantamount to declaring the State of Israel an illegitimate state based on an illegitimate philosophy. It was the first organized attack, and let us be clear, it was the first highly organized attack on world Jewry since the defeat of Hitler's armies. By an almost unbearable coincidence, the resolution passed on the anniversary of "Kristallnacht," November 10, 1938, when Nazis smashed the windows of Jewish stores and homes all over Germany, announcing to the world that Germany's Jews were marked for destruction.

Thirty-seven years later, in the very institution established to eliminate violence from international life, another announcement was made the Jewish state was marked for destruction. More than any single act, I believe, the passage of the "Zi-

onism-is-racism" resolution symbolized the death of the dream of the United Nations as an institution dedicated to reason, democracy, and peace. It symbolized the triumph of forces of unreason, hate, violence, war in the very power built to celebrate the opposite values. The resolution, of course, had very special significance for the United Nations for another reason; it was the first time, though not the last, that a majority of the U.N., made up almost exclusively of nondemocratic states, decided to arrogate to themselves the right to declare a democratic member state illegitimate.

That, in my opinion, is the reason it is so very important that this conference be held today and discussions of these issues take place in our country, in Israel, and throughout the world. Rousseau was not the first and certainly not the last to point out that might cannot long endure unless it is first transformed into right. And, states do not long endure if their moral foundations are sacked and destroyed through the corrosion of lies and violence. That is what I believe is at issue in the attack on Israel in the United Nations. You understand that racism in U.N. syntax is the ultimate political crime. It is the ultimate violation of human rights. A state based on racism is an outlaw state, unworthy of membership in what is euphemistically called the family of nations. In U.N. terminology a racist state has no rights at all, it has no right to exist, it has not even a right to defend itself. What was underway in the passage of this resolution was what Nietzche called a transvaluation of values, an effort to turn upside down the understanding of what is legitimate and what is illegitimate. Who had a right to exist and to defend themselves and who has no such right at all.

Adolf Eichmann, in writing his own diaries as he awaited trial in Israel, wrote that he had never really felt personal animosity toward the Jewish people and that he had never acted out of personal hatred. He had simply not thought much about whether it was right or wrong to carry out the orders of his government. He was, after all, simply trying to find effective ways to do what was asked of him by his head of state to do, and he ended this passage by saying, "after all, what is right and what is wrong?" That is the power that the General Assembly of the United Nations claimed on the day it passed the "Zionism-is-racism" resolution. It claimed the power to decide for politics and the world in our time, what is right, what is wrong, what state deserves to live, what to die, what is legitimate, what is illegitimate. It could not be more incompatible with and opposite to our own American conceptions of legitimacy. It is, after all, our Declaration of Independence that declares very clearly what makes a state legitimate. It says that we hold these truths to be understood by all men at all times—that men are created equal, that they are endowed by their creator with certain rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness and that to protect these rights governments are instituted among men deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed.

What makes a government legitimate? The protection of the rights of people. What kind of government is legitimate? A government based on consent of the governed, because it protects those basic rights. So, there was in this resolution a very explicit, not just rejection, but inversion of the meaning of Zionism, of the meaning of the United Nations, of the meaning of good and evil and also, of course, of the doctrine of legitimacy on which the United States is based.

It is important to note that on the same day that the General Assembly passed the "Zionism-is-racism" resolution, it also affirmed the legitimacy of the PLO. It endowed the PLO with the rights of a member state and established a permanent committee with a very large budget to promote the interests of the PLO within the United Nations and within the world. Henceforth, after the declaration of the illegitimacy of Israel and the legitimacy of the PLO, the use of PLO force against Israel would enjoy the support by the same majority of the member states of the United Nations and the use of force by Israel to defend herself with the rights granted by the charter of the United Nations would be treated and characterized as aggression. That follows from the "Zionism-is-racism" resolution, and the declaration of the PLO as a national liberation movement, "the sole representative of the Palestinian people." That is what it meant then and that is what it means today. It was tantamount to declaring an open season on the State of Israel and to declaring Israel's self-defense an act of aggression. That's a shocking, appalling, dreadful fact.

While there may be some positive consequences, as Conor Cruise O'Brien has suggested, there are certainly many negative consequences. The most important negative is confusion—confusion among many people in the world, some of whom have no experience with Israel, no experience with Jews and no experience with Arabs. One African country which I visited—a country without Arabs, without Jews, without Moslems—even featured on its national day a large banner proclaiming "Zionism is racism." We heard only this week the political head of state of an important

friend and allied nation, articulated the same kind of confusion. That person described the right of the PLO to undertake an armed struggle for its territory, the historic right to resort to violence. The same historic tradition, which was alluded to in that discussion, suggests that if a nation seeks peace—as Israel has sought peace from the moment of her founding and is denied peace by persons who continue to make war on her—that such people do not have that right of armed struggle. Our tradition, I think, is quite clear. The right of armed struggle is the right of people subjected to conquest, like Afghans, for example, who never, never relied on violence against their neighbors and who seek only peaceful coexistence. I think that there is terrible confusion engendered by the categories of Zionism and racism and aggression and this confusion continues inside the United Nations and results in the unfair treatment of Israel.

There are many ways in which the State of Israel is routinely mistreated inside the United Nations on an almost daily basis, so routinely that it isn't even noticed any more. For example, the denial to Israel of membership in regional groups. Those groups have important influence on the agenda, the debate, and the outcome of U.N. affairs, and Israel is routinely denied participation. Also, Israel is routinely made the object of demands which are made of no other nation. For example, the demand is made on Israel that she submit to an international conference, made up of the United Nations to settle her borders. There is, I wager, no nation in the U.N. which would be willing to submit the determination of its border to a U.N. conference. Last year in a debate in the General Assembly I suggested that perhaps those countries who had voted in favor of such a resolution would like to have their own border disputes brought before the international conference. This was regarded as unduly provocative, and a great many telegrams were received by the State Department.

In addition, Israel has been subjected to name calling at a level and of a quality which no other nation in the world is subjected to. Israel is called genocidal, neo-Nazi, and of course is regularly described as the racist-Zionist entity. The General Assembly repeatedly introduces resolutions to isolate Israel, asking that trade and aid of any kind, diplomatic representation, and all kinds of relationships with all other peoples and countries be terminated. No other country in the world is made the object of such demands. I believe, after having reflected a good deal on my experience of the past 4 years in the United Nations, that there are many specific things the United States should and should not do with regard to Israel. They can all be summed up basically, I think, in two simple principles: One is that if we Americans desire to be fair to the State of Israel, and to dissociate ourselves utterly from the calumnies heaped on Israel in this body, then we should resolve never to judge Israel by standards which other nations in the United Nations are not judged by. Never, not on any issue and not under any condition. The second is that never under any circumstances should we make demands on the State of Israel that are not made on other member nations of the United Nations. That's what I recommend. Thank you.

Mr. BIALKIN. I just want to say one or two more thank yous. For those of you who did not attend the rally before this meeting this afternoon, it was organized by Malcolm Hoenlein and Peggy Tishman, leading the Jewish Community Relations Council of New York. I would like to express our thanks to them and also to Gen. Uzi Narkiss, who was the commanding general of Central Command at the time of the liberation of Jerusalem in 1967 and who since 1975 has been working around the world and around the clock to reverse the slander of the "Zionism-is-racism" resolution. I feel that this has been an extraordinary experience and we go on from here together. Thank you Benjamin Netanyahu for the idea and inspiration. Thank you for being an audience. We will fight the fight.

Ambassador NETANYAHU. The United Nations has surely never seen a gathering like this in its halls.

### THE OUTDOOR RALLY

Immediately preceding the conference at the United Nations, a massive outdoor rally was held opposite the U.N. cosponsored by the Conference of Presidents of Major American Jewish Organizations and the Jewish Community Relations Council of New York.

Many of the speakers at the outdoor rally also addressed the conference that followed, among them Senator Daniel P. Moynihan, Ambassador Benjamin Netanyahu, Jeane J. Kirkpatrick, Kenneth J. Bialkin, and Rahamim Elazar. They were joined on the podium by a number of other leading New Yorkers—Senator Alfonse

D'Amato, Mayor Edward Koch, Representatives Jack F. Kemp and Major R. Owens, and JCRC president Peggy Tishman.

Still another speaker was Avital Shcharansky, wife of Anatoly Shcharansky, the Jewish activist jailed by the Soviet Union. Following the rally, Mrs. Shcharansky led some 500 persons in a march to the Soviet Mission to the United Nations to hold a vigil for her husband and other imprisoned dissidents.

Senator D'Amato told the rally that the 1975 resolution equating Zionism with racism "was not the beginning or the end of a campaign by several United Nations members to undermine the State of Israel."

Mayor Koch called the U.N. position on Israel "an irrelevancy" and said that the United Nations would never merit praise until it repealed the resolution. He charged that opposition to Israel was led by the Soviet Union, which he described as "one large gulag."

In his speech to the outdoor throng, Representative Owens—a veteran civil rights activist—declared: "One message of the day's observance must be a reaffirmation of the fight against real racism. South African apartheid is real racism. The distorted and dangerous demagoguery of Minister Louis Farrakhan is real racism and anti-Semitism." He added:

"Today's observance must also be a reaffirmation of the longstanding black and Jewish coalition in America, a partnership that must be held up as a model for the people of the Third World across the street in the United Nations." Rep. Owens concluded:

"Blacks and Jews who have suffered from real and deadly racism and real anti-Semitism understand the horror and the danger of phony resolutions that equate Zionism with racism. We blacks and Jews must continue to expose and fight this evil resolution together."

Mr. BIALKIN. Senator Moynihan, you will recall you were a prominent participant in that very important conference at that time. I do recall that you led us in the outcry from 1975 on in being alert to the thrust of that infamous resolution.

And at the conference, indeed, Senator, you noted that there was practically no outcry or protest in the United States or anywhere else. And you have distinguished yourself over the years in keeping that message alive. And this hearing is another illustration of your dedication to the high principle that you have espoused. And we are deeply in your debt.

What is the resolution? What does it mean? Does it do harm? To whom? Bluntly, it is a stain on the United Nations and the community of nations. By linking the word "Zionism" with racism it trivializes the concept of racism. The word begins to lose its meaning.

If anything, the resolution itself is a racist act by condemning a noble, unselfish freedom-seeking concept. Zionism, in its basic sense, is the identification of the Jewish people with its ancient homeland, a redemption of soul and spirit, the rebuilding of a community which was destroyed and dispersed for 2,000 years.

It is tolerance, and acceptance, and love, and sacrifice, and struggle, and dying for the right to lead a free and noble life in "Eretz Israel." It is a love for Jerusalem and its restoration as the eternal capital of the reborn State of Israel, undivided, proud, free, and tolerant of the aspirations and religious rights of others.

We must recognize that cynical act for what it was. The Arab world given the chance would destroy, obliterate, Israel. Many Arab states remain today in a state of war, pledging to drive Israel away, to terminate its 43-year existence. The destruction of Israel, nothing less, is the objective—make no mistake.

The purpose of the resolution is to delegitimatize Israel, to rob it of sovereignty, to exclude it from the family of nations, to isolate it and choke off its life. It fits in with the annual charade of trying to

deny Israel's credentials at the general assembly each year, of excluding Israel from athletic and cultural convocations, of seeking to deny it seating in international councils. There is a pattern; there is a purpose, and there is a motivation. That motivation, Mr. Chairman, is called anti-Semitism, hatred of the Jew.

It is not a fear of settlements, or of economic domination, or of expulsion that motivates the Arabs. There indeed has been no such threat. From the earliest days, the 1920's and 1930's, the riots and the killings. It is the hatred of the Jew. By lending its office and prestige to this exercise, the United Nations has lost its claim to honor. It has become an accomplice.

No one today really expects the General Assembly of the United Nations to rise above petty political and diplomatic mendacity, so long as it can be manipulated so grossly, so crassly, so unfairly. No country other than Israel has been so challenged to defend its legitimacy. Every year, as I said, Israel's enemies and their acolytes challenge its place in the U.N. General Assembly, seeking to deny its sovereignty.

Verbal and diplomatic wars have not been the only battle. Since its war of independence, Israel has been forced to the battlefield to defend its place as a free nation in four major wars and on inumerable occasions in defense of terrorism. They have mounted a boycott, the Arab boycott of Israel, to deny trade and investment to Israel, condemning and burdening world trade and preventing commerce.

They feed their people on hatred. They revel in the prospect of war, and in that way divert their own national energies away from growth and progress. Today we see them traveling the world seeking to prevent Soviet Jews from finding refuge in Israel.

Just as they succeeded in 1939 to force Great Britain and the white paper to limit Jewish immigration to Palestine to 100,000 souls, thereby consigning millions to the Holocaust—they seek the same today. We are hoping that they will not succeed today. But those efforts by which they are seeking to prevent emigration is nothing less than what they tried in 1938, unfortunately, with some success.

Perhaps the time has come to rescue the United Nations from its manipulators; 1989 and 1990 have produced miracles, where the wind of freedom and the force of democracy have lifted entire countries from the morass of domination and totalitarianism.

No request is too extreme in today's world. If your heart is in your dream, as Dorothy told us in the Wizard of Oz, these things can be achieved.

So, these hearings can serve a purpose, to send the message that the time has come to right a wrong, to restore the integrity of the United Nations, to denounce the hatred and the negative rejectionism of the Arab world and to drive toward honesty and balance in the Middle East.

The U.S. Senate and this committee can take the lead in the Congress with its efforts at the White House, with the Department of State—as this morning, Mr. Chairman, you have so nobly advanced—in the realm of public opinion to change that awful deed, to demand the repeal of that obscene act. If you do, your reward

will be the highest than one can aspire to—the correction of an undeserved and malicious injustice.

I deeply thank you for the privilege of appearing before you.

Senator MOYNIHAN. Thank you, sir, for telling us some painful truths—painful, but absolutely necessary to be told. We will get back to your statement during our questioning.

## STATEMENT OF BURTON JOSEPH, FORMER CHAIRMAN, ANTI-DEFAMATION LEAGUE

Mr. JOSEPH. Thank you, sir.

Let me commend you, Mr. Chairman, Senator Boschwitz, and members of this Senate body, members for their courage and foresight in sponsoring this resolution.

This resolution, Senate Joint Resolution 246 of the Senate of the United States is concise, tightly drafted, and totally worthy of support. I will have no comment to you on its contents. It stands in my opinion on its own.

Let me direct my remarks then, sir, to the subject of the new world that we live in, the world of emerging nationhood and the work of this illustrious committee.

What are the forces at work? And how will this Congress and this Government respond to the critical role offered to it in these awesome times?

The two powerful ideas that arose this century and are survivors of the dramatic ideological changes taking place in the world are nationality and democracy. The United States is the world model for democracy. Further, the world recognizes the United States as a great model for constitutional nationalism.

Persuaded by this model, the Eastern European countries with the courage and determination have fought back and overcome the Soviet Communist assault. However, a second assault against democracy and nationalism, against Israel is still underway and, in fact, growing. It is the insidious, long-term, relentless, Arab-radical Moslem assault.

The people of Israel understand best of all nationalism, its name is Zion and the return to the land of Zion—Israel. This return of people from the world of diaspora, from a 2,000-year exile is the focus and mean of Israeli nationalism—or Zionism.

The Jewish return to Israel is the amalgam of the ancient bond between people and the land. To bring this return a system of democracy, including democracy for those people of other faiths and cultures is a paralleled—perhaps a better word than paralleled is a similar attempt to incorporate within a governmental system the diverse cultural forces that are Israel.

I say similar and for this reason: modern Israel has the history and experience of the United States to follow. This, our own land of many cultures, this land of many people of many origins, but fulfilling themselves in the image and goal that this land has and will continue to welcome them all, this land of ours which Israel emulates will, we know, continue to take on to itself the incorporation of all peoples into a single democratic structure.

This being the case, what has been accomplished in Israel is the absolute opposite of racism. It is the cementing of men—women

and children from dozens of different countries, forms and fashions, even different religious practices—into a common system of education, military service, governmental and community responsibility and above all, the firm knowledge that within their own borders of a nation, they no longer are the targets of the racist or the killer.

It is the safe borders that drive the Israeli psyche, a country of survivors, children of survivors. They can think of nothing else but safe borders. It is a government of dedicated, sometimes brilliant, oftentimes stubborn people. They know that democracy and pluralism are friends in hand. They know that racism and totalitarianism are enemies against.

To charge Israel with racism is folly multiplied by hate. The world has had enough of hate. The time has come for the United Nations to renounce all resolutions of hate and separation. The United Nations must reject attempts by certain forces within it to divide the world body into hateful pieces.

The United States should work with other countries to this end. Some foreign governments and international entities have taken steps in this direction—we have discussed this.

In addition, the United Nations has encouraged the moderate Arab states to repudiate the resolution as well. As long as the Arab world continues to propagate the myth that Zionism is a form of racism, progress in achieving Arab-Israeli peace will be hampered. How can Israel be expected to trust its Arab neighbors, when they continue to deny its existence.

I quote from remarks for the Vice President of the United States. Let me highlight, because he has already been given a lot credit for his Yeshiva speech. He says:

> We too would welcome a United Nations with renewed sense of mission and moral purpose. But we also understand that the U.N. can never fulfill its dreams of its founders until it regains its reputation for moral integrity.
>
> The Soviet Union—which played a key role in the adoption of Zionism is racism resolution—can play a key role in working with the United States and the other democracies in a coordinated effort in the General Assembly to regain repeal of this loathsome provision.

Let me suggest, Mr. Chairman, parenthetically that due to some personal exchanges that I have had with certain members of the Supreme Soviet Congress, we could find some colleagues in the effort of this committee.

We appreciate past efforts and leadership by the United States in the international effort to rescind the U.N. resolution. It is time for the United States to step up these efforts. In today's changing world, there is no place for such virulent, anti-Israel rhetoric.

This resolution under consideration by this body reflects the return to brotherhood in the United Nations. It rejects racism and hate. It is good and proper work. Let us have a successful result.

Thank you, sir.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Joseph follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF BURTON M. JOSEPH

I am Burton M. Joseph, former National Chairman and current Honorary Chairman of the Anti-Defamation League. I am honored to appear today before the Senate Foreign Relations Subcommittee on Near Eastern and South Asian Affairs to testify in strong support of S.J. Res. 246, a resolution calling for immediate repeal of the infamous U.N. Resolution 3379 equating Zionism with racism. Let me com-

mend and thank Chairman Moynihan, Senator Boschwitz, and the members of this Senate body for their courage and foresight in sponsoring this resolution.

This Resolution, S.J. Res. 246 of the Senate of the United States is concise, tightly drafted, and worthy of support. I will have no comment to you on its content; it stands, in my opinion, on its own.

Let me direct my remarks, then, to the subject of the new world that we live in, the world of emerging nationhood and the work of this illustrious committee. What are the forces at work and how will this Congress and this Government respond to the critical role offered to it in these awesome times.

The two powerful ideas that arose this century, and are the survivors of the dramatic ideological changes taking place in the world, are nationality and democracy. The United States is the world model for democracy. Further, the world recognizes the United States as the great model for constitutional nationalism. Persuaded by this model, the Eastern European countries with courage and determination fought back and overcame the Soviet Communist assault. However, a second assault, against democracy and nationalism, against Israel, is still underway, in fact growing; it is the insidious, long-term, relentless Arab-radical Moslem assault. The people of Israel understand best of all nationalism, its name is Zion and the return to the land of Zion—Israel. This return of people from the world of diaspora, from a 2,000-year exile is the focus and meaning of Israeli nationalism—Zionism. The Jewish return to Israel is the amalgam of the ancient bond between people and the land. To bring with this return, a system of democracy, including democracy for those people of other faiths and cultures, is a paralleled attempt to incorporate within a governmental system the diverse cultural forces that are Israel. I say paralleled and for this reason. Modern Israel has the history and experience of the United States to follow: this, our own land of many cultures; this land of many people of many origins, but fulfilling themselves in the image and goal that this land has and will continue to welcome them all. This land of ours, which Israel emulates, will, we know, continue to take onto itself the incorporation of all peoples into a single democratic structure.

This being the case—what has been accomplished in Israel is the absolute opposite of racism. It is the cementing of men, women, and children from dozens of different countries, forms and fashions, even different religious practices into a common system of education, military service, governmental and community responsibility and above all, the firm knowledge that within their own borders of a nation, they no longer are the target of the racist or the killer.

It is safe borders that drive the Israeli psyche, a country of survivors, and children of survivors. They can think of nothing else but safe borders. It is a government of dedicated, sometimes brilliant, oftentimes stubborn people. They know that democracy and pluralism are friends in hand. They know that racism and totalitarianism are enemies against.

To charge Israel with racism is folly multiplied by hate. The world has had enough of hate. The time has come for the United Nations to renounce all resolutions of hate and separation. The United Nations must reject attempts by certain forces within it to divide the world body into hateful pieces. The United States should work with other countries to this end. Some foreign governments and international entities have taken steps in this direction. The European Parliament and the parliaments of Holland, Australia, Peru, Uruguay, and Guatemala have formally criticized the U.N. resolution. More needs to be done.

In addition, the United States should encourage the moderate Arab states to repudiate the resolution as well. As long as the Arab world continues to propagate the myth that Zionism is a form of racism, progress in achieving Arab-Israeli peace will be hampered. How can Israel be expected to trust its Arab neighbors when they continue to deny its existence?

I quote from remarks of the Vice President of the United States:

"We too would welcome a United Nations with a renewed sense of mission and moral purpose. But we also understand that the U.N. can never fulfill the dreams of its founders until it regains its reputation for moral integrity. Rescinding "Zionism-is-Racism" would be a major step in that direction. And as Secretary of State Baker stated in a speech earlier this year, Arab willingness to rescind this odious resolution would send a powerful signal to Israel—just as Arab unwillingness to rescind this resolution sends a powerful signal of another sort.

"The Soviet Union—which played a key role in the adoption of the Zionism-is-Racism resolution—can play a key role in working with the United States, and the other democracies, in a coordinated effort in the General Assembly, to gain repeal of this loathsome provision."

(Let me suggest parenthetically that due to some personal exchanges certain members of the Supreme Soviet Congress could be your colleagues in this effort.)

We appreciate past efforts and leadership by the United States in the international effort to rescind the U.N. resolution. It is time for the United States to step up these efforts. In today's changing world, there is no place for such virulent anti-Israel rhetoric.

This resolution under consideration by this body reflects the return to brotherhood in the United Nations. It rejects racism and hate. It is good and proper work. Let it have a successful result.

Senator MOYNIHAN. Thank you, Mr. Joseph.

I do not know that three more moving statements have ever been made before this committee on an issue of this consequence. I am going to request that the published record of this hearing is sent to each of our Embassies abroad by the Secretary of State and read by our Ambassadors. I will ask that our Ambassadors take your message to the countries to which they are accredited in the hope that they will understand what you have set forth with such power. There was a portion of the membership of the United Nations when that was going on which dismissed the activities of the General Assembly. Sophisticated countries could say, well, it was simply words. But words can kill. Words can destroy.

I think all three of you have made that so clear. What is at issue is the legality of the state. In the aftermath of the formal international conventions about racism to declare a state "racist" is to declare it to be an illegal entity. And that is what we have here. Too many excuses have been made.

Senator Boschwitz, you were living in Berlin at the time of Krystallnacht. Were you not?

Senator BOSCHWITZ. No.

Senator MOYNIHAN. You had just gotten out.

Some years after the vote was taken on November 10, 1975, my wife and I were at a dinner in New York with the then French permanent representative, a very distinguished man, a career officer. And my wife raised this event and the French representative said, "Well, you know, we would not have lost that vote, if it had not been for the provocative speech that your husband gave on the occasion."

This was a kind of retroactive remission of guilt, or whatever you might like, for the speech I gave was given after the vote. It is called a speech in explanation of the vote. It is a United Nation's practice. It is often the case that you speak after the vote to say why you voted as you did. And it was very precisely to avoid giving anyone that excuse that we did not speak beforehand. And yet, some still argue that the United States asked for it. "They had it coming."

And our Government—as Mr. Joseph has said, and I am sure Senator Boschwitz agrees—has never made it clear how unacceptable this is. We ought to make it a point to say to these nations that we have to get by this issue before we talk to you about anything else.

I do not know any better way to make it clear than to see that this record is placed by the hands of the Secretary of State along with a request that this record be sent to every Embassy with instructions to be read.

I think we can ask in this committee that this be done, and I believe we will. Senator Boschwitz.

Senator BOSCHWITZ. I so much agree with you in that effort, Mr. Chairman. I think that we have to carefully take a look at what is sent, so that the statements of these three gentlemen, and I have to review these statements of Secretary Bolton which perhaps should also be included.

Senator MOYNIHAN. Well, I am sure that is the point exactly.

Senator BOSCHWITZ. Whether or not all of our dialog and so forth should be sent, we ought to take a look at, but there is no question that American Ambassadors in other countries have not taken the strong attitude with respect to this resolution and they have to know what the attitude of the Senate is, and the attitude of the Congress. I might say that Representative Bill Green of your State has introduced a similar resolution over on the House side, and either by not giving it the proper emphasis or by brushing it aside or in some way not expressing the outrage that you have expressed so eloquently here this morning—I often wish I had the skill to be as eloquent as the senior Senator from New York—but unless that is expressed by the Ambassadors and our State Department there will be by virtue of default something of a statement that well, this is more of a procedural matter, this is something of not great importance to the United States, therefore we can nod our head and go on with other business, and that should not be.

I know that you have talked to me before, Mr. Chairman, about this very thing of what is happening at our Embassies in various parts of the world, and that is an important part of what we should achieve from this particular hearing.

I made a note in Mr. Reich's testimony that the age old dream of return to their historic homeland, something that we will be restating again here in a few days during Passover. I might just say as a personal note that my father in 1902 attended I think the fourth Annual Zionist Convention, and at that time—so that Zionism in my family goes back quite a way, and much of my family lives there, because as you noted I come from Europe and we sprinkled all over the world. Just now, I am now dealing with one of my cousins who had a loss in her family who spent the war in Shanghai. Many went to Israel, some came here, and there are others sprinkled here and there.

But I really thank all of you for your very eloquent testimony. Each one was more eloquent than his predecessor, and I will see to it, with my good friend Senator Moynihan, that we spread that testimony so that it just does not stay in the archives and that it becomes a meaningful part not only of the record but of the understanding that the State Department and all of its diplomats have with respect to the positions of this country and the Senate.

Senator MOYNIHAN. Senator, I think there is nothing more that really needs to be said.

Mr. REICH. Mr. Chairman, may I just add something?

Senator MOYNIHAN. Yes, Mr. Reich.

Mr. REICH. In my capacity as president of B'nai B'rith I just returned from Chile, Uruguay, and Argentina and had the privilege of meeting with the Presidents of each of those countries, and preceding that with the American Ambassadors.

I must tell you that this was an item on the agenda at those meetings, and particularly with the American Ambassadors in those countries. We discussed many things, and at one particular session this subject did not come up. As we were leaving the ambassador suggested to me that I might want to raise that with the foreign minister of the particular country.

Senator BOSCHWITZ. The American Ambassador?

Mr. REICH. The American Ambassador had said that, so clearly this hearing does serve a very important purpose, and your comments before about sending this throughout the world to American Ambassadors are certainly appropriate, but I can share with you my perception that the State Department is very much concerned about this issue, speaking out on it and is reaching out with as many contacts as possible, and I think the conduct—at least the American Ambassadors that I have met in my travels—their conduct reflects their interest and their concern about this important subject.

Mr. BIALKIN. Why not ask the American Ambassador in Jordan whether he would bring the same thing up to a visiting delegation? It is pretty easy in Uruguay and Chile.

Senator BOSCHWITZ. Where was this?

Mr. REICH. In Chile, Uruguay, and Argentina. Mr. Bialkin's point is well-taken, in terms of Jordon, but I do not want the record to go without some reference to my recent experience within the last 10 days.

Senator MOYNIHAN. Good. The committee is pleased to hear that.

This is anecdotal, but they say data is the plural of anecdote. The chairman of your subcommittee was traveling in North Africa prior to visiting Israel and spoke with a half-dozen career officers, able Foreign Service officers, mentioned our having enacted a statute in 1987 with respect to the Zionism resolution, and asked had they ever seen ever cable traffic instructing them—these were mostly Arabists; that is, Americans who speak Arabic—instructing them to bring this issue up. Uniformly they said "No, they had not," and these are not persons inattentive to such details.

This has not had the priority it needs to have, for the reasons Mr. Joseph so carefully set forth. In any event, let us see if that cannot change.

Senator BOSCHWITZ. The Senator from New York has spoken to me about those experiences, that is why I emphasize the importance of moving around the record of this hearing, and perhaps our comments and this particular comment should somehow be highlighted in what we send around.

The importance of what Mr. Reich says is, Brazil I note was among those nations who spoke out in favor of the resolution. Perhaps some other South American nations did as well. So, it is important that the message be carried in that part of the world as well. I had a cousin in Uruguay, and that is one of the countries that was mentioned.

Senator MOYNIHAN. Well, there we are. The morning time has expired. The committee cannot sit beyond the noon hour with the Senate in session.

We thank the members of the panel and we take notice that Mr. Malcolm Hoenline is with us as well as Mr. Michael Miller and we welcome them to our committee.

The record will remain open for statements of other members who might wish to have them included, and we will pursue all of the matters involved here. I do not know just when this resolution will be adopted, but it will be very shortly now and we will see to it that the matter is resolved.

Senator Pell, our chairman, has a statement which will be included in the record at the outset of the hearing. With that, I thank the Chair, I thank the staff, I thank our recording secretary, and the hearing is concluded.

[Whereupon at 11:40 a.m. the hearing was concluded, to reconvene at the call of the Chair.]

○